

The Nation.

NEW YORK, THURSDAY, JULY 31, 1879.

The Week.

THERE have been ninety-six new cases and thirty-seven deaths from the yellow fever reported at Memphis during the week, the largest number of new cases being the nineteen on the 23d inst., and the smallest the eight reported in yesterday's despatches, a diminution which, moreover, has been gradual and constant. The exodus of the citizens, however, continues, and on Monday of the probable 45,000 inhabitants (the census of 1870 says 40,226) a special census reported but 16,110 persons left in the city, of whom only 4,283 were whites. The Howard Association has announced that for the present it has no need of nurses or physicians from without; and "interviewed" refugees maintain that the city is in the most perfect sanitary condition possible. The refugees have taken the disease and spread alarm in various directions, though in but few cases. Of these, three have occurred in this city—the two in Brooklyn having come from Havana—and several at Shelbyville and Bon Aqua Springs, Tenn., at Louisville and St. Louis. The latest reports from Mississippi City, which come through the National Board of Health, announce five cases and one death. Monday there was the first death of the season from unmistakable yellow fever at New Orleans, but, though it caused a panic, and Natchez and Shreveport instantly quarantined against the city, it has been followed by no others except two doubtful ones.

Senator Sherman has gone up to Maine to speak in the canvass, and delivered a long speech on the 23d at Portland. He opened by a wave of the bloody shirt, showing that to repeal the legislation of the war directed against the South was "State rights" and "nullification," and "revolution and anarchy," and before this, he said, "questions of money, labor, and property sunk into insignificance." After this—which sounds a little wild, but was doubtless called for by the occasion—he spoke at considerable length on the comparatively trifling subject of the resumption of specie payments and the reduction of the national debt, giving a brief résumé of the financial history of the country between 1860 and 1873, and showing that the difficulties which had to be encountered in making any preparation for resumption were mainly due to the action of Congress. He made some amusing quotations from speeches in and out of Congress prophesying the frightful calamities that would result from resumption, but the only Republican he exposed in this way was Mr. W. D. Kelley. He then told the curious story of resumption itself and of the refunding of the five-twenty bonds, and gave some account of the revival of industry. His happiest bit was in showing that he is now doing what the Greenbackers have always clamored for most—redeeming bonds in greenbacks, paying the interest on the national debt in greenbacks, and receiving customs duties in greenbacks—and yet they are not satisfied.

About silver he was both clear and instructive. He said that to make it circulate at par with gold the ratio between the coins must be the market ratio, and not 16 to 1, "which means the single standard of silver"; that \$35,801,000 of silver had been coined since 1878, and the Treasury had been only able to put \$13,359,942 of it afloat, and of this over \$6,500,000 had been returned. He proposed, therefore, to coin it without limit when "the commercial nations had all agreed on a market ratio by which they would stand," but not sooner. He concluded by another short wave of the bloody shirt and a eulogy on the Republican party, which had, he admitted, been guilty of some errors, but on the whole had done great things—which is true. It appeared plainly in his speech that he shared the very common opinion in the Republican ranks, that all legislation passed to carry out the objects or secure the results of

the war by the Republican party is, in some sense, part and parcel of the Constitution itself, and only repealable, if repealable at all, with the consent of the Republicans, no matter what the majority in Congress may think. The necessity he felt of waving the bloody shirt, even when his subject was finance, and the speaker Secretary of the Treasury, is also one which nearly all Republican orators seem to feel, and reminds one of the actor at the Surrey Theatre who had the humble rôle of a footman, and who—his sole duty in the play being to say "Sir, your carriage is waiting"—added, "and the man who would lay hands on a woman, except in kindness, is unworthy of the name of a Briton." Secretary Sherman is, however, by far the ablest man the Republicans have to show, and has solid claims on the confidence and gratitude of the country.

General Butler has announced his intention of repeating this fall his chronic attempt upon the Governorship of Massachusetts. For the first time he is to make a confessedly personal canvass, and the call for a purely Butler convention at Worcester in September indicates that the Claimant is convinced of the futility of repeating his former efforts for a "regular" nomination; although Senator Dawes, in an interview, said there was no doubt that Butler would be the Democratic nominee. Still, in that event, he would run with the Democratic "endorsement" only, in effect, and could certainly not get more Democratic votes than he got last year. The announcement of his candidacy has excited no surprise, and but little alarm anywhere except among the Democrats represented by the *Boston Post*, to whom the annual Butler panic has been definitively transferred—perhaps as an ironical punishment for the delight they used to experience in witnessing Republican terror. Senators Dawes and Hoar make light of the General's chances, and the Republicans generally say they will make an active canvass if Butler does, but not otherwise. It is probable, however, that they will be driven to do so, for apparently Butler is able, in some occult way, to extract as much pleasure from an active canvass as he would from a successful one. His recurrent candidacy is one of the inexplicable incidents of contemporary politics. The reputation for political shrewdness that he has acquired can hardly be so false that he can imagine himself in any contingency a possible Presidential candidate with fair prospects of election; and the cost of the Butler kind of canvass must be greater, we should say, than the somewhat idle enjoyment to be derived from making it. Possibly ex-Collector Simmons, who is out for his old patron, would suggest an explanation in the following sentence of the General's letter to the man Usher: "It will be agreed by all that our candidature last year did the State very considerable service in directing the attention of the people of the Commonwealth to the necessity of reformatory changes in the administration of its government." It seems odd, however, to consider Butler posing in the attitude of a self-sacrificing benefactor of his State to the extent which this suggestion implies.

The Republican Conventions of Pennsylvania and Wisconsin were held on the 23d at Harrisburg and Madison respectively. At the former Mr. Samuel Butler, of Chester County, was nominated for State Treasurer; and in Wisconsin, Governor William E. Smith and the present State officers were renominated. The platforms adopted and the various speeches delivered were eloquent rather than precise, which speaks volumes for the heroic enthusiasm of the delegates, who evidently had a cut-and-dried task to perform. Both conventions affirmed that the United States are a nation and not a league; that the Democrats are endeavoring now to obtain by "plotting" what they lost in fight; and that the Republican party is charged with the preservation of the nation it has already saved. The Pennsylvania platform, of course, advocated the continuance of the protective tariff, a subject upon which the other body was silent. Upon the currency question there was very little frankness shown

in either convention. In Pennsylvania the payment of the national debt in "ceda" was favored; and in Wisconsin a resolution was passed which should gratify Secretary Sherman, although it did not personally mention him thus early, and which approved of a currency "such as we have at present." It cannot well be that we shall have no more definite party utterances than these before the national conventions of next year instruct the several States.

The fears expressed during the week in the Western news despatches, that General Miles's ambition to become a brigadier would lead him to bring on a general Indian war, must be interpreted like the lugubrious advice to the mob not to duck the poor gentleman in the horse-pond. Certain classes at the West, as we know too well, are always "spoiling for a fight" with the Indians, and they have been anything but alarmed by the collision between General Miles's patrol and a Sioux band in Northern Montana, in the neighborhood of Milk River. There is, fortunately, every reason to believe in the prudence of General Miles, and to suppose him, as well as the authorities at Washington, to be fully impressed with the gravity of the present situation on the border, which Sitting Bull and his people have overstepped in the endeavor to keep from starving by following the buffalo southward. Not only is this formidable body in a quasi-hostile attitude, to say the least, but the Blackfeet and other tribes of the Saskatchewan have had a famishing winter, and are now with difficulty sustained by the issue of rations. The food-region for them, too, lies to the south and in the limits of the United States, and their junction with the warriors of Sitting Bull would greatly enhance the chances and the formidableness of a war. Supposing our forces equal to the emergency, and that Sitting Bull should be driven back into the Dominion, the Canadian Government would have a by no means enviable problem thrust upon it. But we cannot conceive that the oscillation of a savage tribe between two adjacent countries should go on for ever without a mutual understanding and joint provision for removing this menace to the peaceful settlement of the Northwest.

The verdict of the jury in the Buford case, which was that of guilty, and specified the prisoner's punishment as imprisonment for life, is satisfactory to lovers of justice in general of course, but it is particularly encouraging to wise and sincere friends of the South. Taken in connection with the similar verdict in the Cox case recently tried in Atlanta, it is possible that it may indicate a tendency upon the part of Southern juries to deal with Southern outrages as the juries of other civilized lands deal with crime. Buford's case, however, was a peculiarly flagrant one: he had shot a judge for a decision adverse to him, and his defence of insanity was a thoroughly transparent *pis-aller* of his counsel. Even a Kentucky jury could not fail to see the enormity of Buford's crime, and the consequences which his acquittal would have upon the community's respect for law; and even this jury, which is described as an ignorant one in the main, could not be made to believe insane a man who had been a creditable public lecturer, a candidate for the Legislature, and a politician whose opponents had never accused him of mental derangement. So that any inference from their verdict that the character of Southern civilization is changing may be justly considered hasty. Still, it is to be said that Buford's acquittal was almost everywhere confidently predicted, and that in a certain degree his conviction is evidence that there are crimes, aside from robbery and rape, in deliberating upon which the Southern mind does not allow its sense of justice to be obscured by its notions of Middle-Age chivalry.

Judge Hilton's manifesto against the Jews at Saratoga two summers ago has been imitated, with less coarseness and less rigor, by Mr. Corbin, the presiding genius of Manhattan Beach and its ap-proaches. His main grievance appears to be that the class in question sit too long at the tables on his piazzas, smoke cheap cigars, and do not drink enough; so that, apparently, a little more fondness for

the promenade, greater extravagance in the consumption of tobacco, and a decided disposition to get drunk, would go far to redeem them in his eyes. He does not complain that they interfere with the good order so remarkable at Coney Island, or add anything to the cares of the police; but for all that, without expressly forbidding them to come on his premises, he wishes to discourage them. The idea of a money discrimination—as, for instance, double fares on the boats and cars, or "two prices" for everything ordered by Jews from his restaurant—does not seem to have occurred to him. In fact, Mr. Corbin's abstaining from any positive measures to carry out his prohibition makes it a *brutum fulmen* for all except the more sensitive and self-respecting of the obnoxious class—i. e., the very ones not aimed at by it. It has consequently been regarded as a mere advertising expedient, and some of Grant's enemies have, we are sorry to say, compared it, as a family measure, with the army order expelling the Jews from the Federal lines—with an evident intent to injure "the boom."

It looks as if there would have to be a new Rapid Transit Commission to secure the object for which the unfortunate gentlemen who now hold that barren title were appointed. This is due to one of the interesting blunders which municipal legislatures occasionally make. The Aldermen were so desirous of putting themselves "squarely on the record" that they reconsidered their veto of the Commission's report, it will be remembered, and definitively settled the matter by the emphasis of a second veto. Now, the property-holders of the new wards are anxious that the routes laid out above the Harlem River should be adopted, to which the Aldermen have no earthly objection, but which they have put it out of their power to bring about, as they might once have done, by the adoption of that part of the Commission's report which did not involve suspicious favors to that well-known *bête-noir* of the legislator, the corrupting Mr. Vanderbilt. All the remedy that we have seen suggested for this charming state of affairs is a new appeal to the mayor by the necessary fifty property-owners for the appointment of a new commission to visa, so to speak, part of the old report. Steps have already been taken to this end.

The progress in harvesting the wheat crop in the Northwestern States, which are the principal producers, was such during the week as to warrant the expectation that the product in quantity and quality will be fully up to the average. This, together with the European advices, which report short crops and foreshadow an unusually large demand on this country, induced free drawing of commercial bills against grain shipments to be made in August and September. The amount of these anticipatory bills was such as to overcome the present demand for remittances to Europe and to break down the rates for all bills on London; prime drawers at the beginning of the week asked 4.85 for sixty-day drafts and 4.87 for demand drafts, but these were subsequently reduced to 4.83 to 4.83½, and 4.84½ to 4.85, respectively. The same reasons that depressed sterling exchange gave an impetus to the upward speculation in the stocks and securities of the railroads of the Northwestern States, and there was a large advance in the prices of all. Aside from this movement the Stock Exchange markets were dull. United States bonds were rather weak for the four per cents, and it really begins to look as if some of the national banks would relinquish their note circulation rather than substitute four per cent. bonds as security for their notes in place of 10-40 bonds, which have been called for redemption and interest on which has ceased. The Treasury bond settlements have all passed without disturbance to the money market, and the rate for loans here rules at 2 to 3 per cent.; in London, discounts are yet obtainable at the rate of ¼ to ½ of 1 per cent. per annum.

The last monthly report of the Bureau of Statistics completes the statement of exports and imports for the fiscal year ending June 30. The total value of the former was \$710,423,743, of the

latter \$445,792,141, or an excess of exports amounting to \$264,636,602. This is an increase of some seven millions over the surplus of 1877-78, and involves an increase in the exports of \$15,600,000, and of imports of \$8,800,000. For the past seven months, however, the upward tendency has been with the imports. The year before the panic marked the culmination of the adverse commercial balances since the war. The average of these balances annually was, as the *Commercial Bulletin* shows, \$98,800,000; the total for nine years (deducting the net export of specie) being \$363,000,000. During the past six years, on the contrary, the credit balance has averaged \$125,000,000 and the total (net export of specie added) has been \$924,000,000. Nothing can show more forcibly the debt-paying capacity of the country, and the material rewards of industry and economy; the moral gain cannot be stated in figures.

The so-called "Letellier Case," even more than the question of protection, influenced the last general election in Canada, and has since been the chief topic of discussion in the politics of the Dominion. It has at length been settled. Mr. Letellier, it will be remembered, was the Lieutenant-Governor of Quebec, and had dismissed the Provincial Ministry, in spite of its having a working majority in the House, on the ground that it had treated him with disrespect and had forced certain measures that were not in the public interest. The Dominion Parliament at once took up the issue thus created, and Sir John Macdonald, then the leader of the Opposition, after a parliamentary defeat, made it a leading question after the subsequent dissolution, and upon becoming the Conservative premier at the next session, with a large majority behind him, demanded Letellier's dismissal at the hands of Lord Lorne. The latter referred the matter to the Home Government, which, generally wise in inaction, referred it back to the Governor-General, and Dr. Robitaille has just been announced as Mr. Letellier's successor. There can be no doubt of the wisdom of the Beaconsfield Government's refusal to interfere; anything other would have irritated Canada as, in the opinion of less radical judges than Mr. Goldwin Smith, it would have been foolish to irritate her. As for the pith of the real question at issue, it must be admitted that Sir John Macdonald has had the good fortune to be more nearly right than is often his lot. There was a cloud of dust raised and a great deal of heat engendered, but the dismissal of Mr. Letellier seems, in spite of all the complexities of the matter, to be a vindication of the responsibility of parliamentary ministers to their electors, a protest against arbitrary individual action on the part of individual executives, and an emphasis of the well-understood supremacy of the different Canadian provinces in purely local matters. On the other hand, those who regard provincial cabinets as costly and somewhat ridiculous surpluses in the Dominion system, will find their objections confirmed by the incident just closed.

From England there is little news beyond the Zulu victory, whatever attention can be spared from the obsequies of the Prince Imperial and the performances of the Comédie-Française being bestowed unavailingly on the deplorable condition of agriculture, which is now in a more serious condition than trade. A royal commission is to enquire into it, and some sensation has been excited by the admission of the Marquis of Hartington that the present land system cannot stand. In fact, it appears more and more likely that the Liberals will now make a desperate effort to dislodge the Tories from the counties, of which they have held almost undisputed possession for two centuries, by offering the tenant-farmers better tenures and more freedom, and by making it easier for landlords to lower their rents and to sell what they cannot afford to keep. The only thing the Tories could oppose to this would be protection for agricultural produce, which, however, they dare not talk of, as it would mean dear food and rouse the working classes to fury.

Lord Chelmsford has delivered himself from a very unpleasant position by winning an apparently decisive victory over the Zulus,

and destroying the large "kraal" which passes for King Cetewayo's capital, Ulundi, and Sir Garnet Wolseley pronounces the war at an end. The difficulty in bringing the king to terms in spite of his two defeats appears to have lain in the fact that the invaders fought him on both occasions behind intrenchments or a wagon laager, and from his experience at Isandula he has believed he could beat them in the open by an impetuous charge. At Isandula, however, besides the surprise, the Zulus were received in line, and even in the open order which the breech-loader has introduced into the tactics of all European armies. In this last fight their onset was received in a hollow square, as in the old days of cavalry charges, and they were routed in half an hour and pursued by the cavalry with heavy slaughter. It is now said that, having redeemed himself, Lord Chelmsford will resign, and leave to Sir Garnet Wolseley the task of settling the terms on which the Zulu king is hereafter to live with his neighbors.

The English Ministry have furnished one more weapon to the Liberals by Lord Salisbury's denial in a recent speech that they incurred any responsibility about reform in Asia Minor by their Convention with Turkey. He says the very idea is "absurd," and that "the utmost they can do is to urge upon every suitable opportunity and with all the energy they can that the promises the Porte had given should be fulfilled." The facts are that the Convention guaranteed Asiatic Turkey against all aggression, and in return for this the Porte promised reform, and the Ministry presented this promise to the country as an assurance that the Turkey they were to defend was to be a renovated Turkey. The present repudiation of all responsibility about reform shows that the Liberals were right in their assumption that the Convention was a cunning device of Lord Beaconsfield's to cover up the substantial defeat he sustained at Berlin, and the *Economist* compares it now, in language never before applied by respectable writers to ministers of the Crown, to "a check with no effects behind it in order to get respectably out of a tavern."

Germany is passing through the most serious political crisis which has overtaken her since 1866. Prince Bismarck, before the adjournment of the Reichstag on the 13th ult., formally broke with the National-Liberal party in one of his most powerful speeches, and put himself at the head of a combination composed of the Conservatives and Ultramontanes. Not only has Dr. Falk been dismissed, as a sop to the Ultramontanes, but they have been further gratified by an agreement that all money over a certain amount raised by the new protective tariff shall be divided among the separate States, which is a distinct concession to the Particularist interest. Encouraged by his success thus far, the Chancellor now proposes that the duration of the Imperial Parliament shall be extended to four or six years, and intervals of two shall elapse between its sessions, so that the taxes will have to be voted for two years at least, thus greatly diminishing parliamentary control over the revenues. This project, which involves several amendments to the Constitution, is now before a committee, and it has filled the Liberals of all shades with dismay, and the National-Liberal party is said to be utterly disorganized.

The Austrian Liberals have also been unfortunate at the late general elections. They have lost forty-five seats, leaving them with a majority of only eleven, which can hardly be called a working majority. The gains are made mainly by the landed interest, and indicate a revival of the influence of the great proprietors, particularly in the Slav constituencies, and the cause is very much the same as that which put Disraeli in power in England in 1873, and has enabled Bismarck to carry his tariff and other schemes in Germany—viz., a sort of weariness, aggravated by the hard times, of the rule of the commercial and professional classes, which has now lasted since 1866. Having tried the "thinkers" and progressive men without attaining complete happiness, the constituencies turn to the country squires.

SENTIMENTALISM IN POLITICS.

THERE is at present some curiosity in the public mind to know how the Administration feels towards the solid Democratic South after the contest it has had with its representative majority in Congress. Mr. W. E. Chandler essayed to gratify this feeling a few days since by assuring a reporter that the President far out-did himself and his fellow-Stalwarts in the indignation which he felt at the general political course of the South during his Administration. Whether this was merely the random assertion of a mind not remarkable for sobriety of judgment, or the shrewd guess of an astute politician, it is worthy of consideration from its representative character. The notion that such a feeling on the part of the Administration would, under the circumstances, be eminently reasonable, is entertained by a large majority of the Republican party, and, no doubt also in secret, by no small number of Democrats.

The case presents itself to the average mind in a form like this: When President Hayes came into office, there was a contest between the two wings of his party as to whether he should or should not use the military force at his disposal to keep Chamberlain and Packard in power in the States of South Carolina and Louisiana, and whether he should continue to confine the Federal officers in the South to that class of men who held them under the Grant régime. In this contest the white Democrats of the South believed that the interests of their section were deeply involved. If Hayes yielded to the Stalwarts, governments which they considered as among the most odious would be enforced upon them, and the material prosperity of their section would continue exposed to all the dangers and drawbacks arising from bad administration. Instead of pursuing this course, which from the ordinary politician's point of view was that demanded by the interests of his own party, the President did what the South desired, and thus conferred upon the latter a valuable and lasting privilege. Such being the case, it was supposed that the common sentiment of gratitude would prompt them to do something in return. Since the benefit came from a source which, in some sort, represented the Republican party, it seemed nothing more than reasonable that the expression of gratitude should take the form of a favor to that party, and the only favor which could be done it was that of voting its ticket. Hence the President is supposed to have looked with great interest to see the Southern people rise up and overthrow the Democratic party in all the Congressional districts where the beneficent effects of his policy had been felt, or, at least, to stay away from the polls in sufficient numbers to allow the Republicans to elect their candidates. The Stalwarts assured him that no such result would follow, that the South was not to be trusted to do anything but oppose his own party to the utmost under all circumstances, and that it would use the very power he put into its hands for the benefit of his political enemies. To a mind so magnanimous as that of Mr. Hayes this seemed hardly credible, and he went on in full confidence that he would find his good feelings and intentions reciprocated. Time has proved the Stalwarts to have been right, so far as the impossibility of recruiting the Republican party from the white Democrats of the South is concerned, and now the President and his supporters are supposed to be lamenting the failure of his policy and the ingratitude of humanity.

Plausible as this view appears at first sight, it is founded on those radically false ideas of the objects of political management which, diffused among the masses, constitute one of the great difficulties with which the progress of sound principles has to deal. Those who adopt this view do not think it worth while to ask whether the course of the President has or has not promoted the cause of good government in the South, but only whether it has been successful as a political manoeuvre. It assumes that the only motive which actuated the President and his supporters was that of securing a Republican Congress, and, of course, the effort is pronounced a failure because this end was not gained. The lesson which the more radical Republicans would have the country learn is, that the South is not to be trusted. But if they will look a little

deeper they will find that a much more valuable lesson is taught them.

Wise statesmanship accepts human nature as it is, with all its infirmities, and does not assume that men in general are either angels or devils. Human nature is so constituted that it does not overflow with gratitude for any act, however beneficent, unless that act be prompted by a disinterested spirit. Just so far as support and gratitude are expected in return, just so far is the moral effect of the act diminished. As Morley says in his study of Rousseau, "A service done in expectation of gratitude is from that fact stripped of the quality which makes gratitude due, and is a mere piece of egoism in altruistic disguise." In political life men's innermost motives are as clear as the light, and the more gratitude a public man expects from his constituents for a virtuous act, the less he will get. Now, every one feels and knows that neither political party is at the present time actuated by any higher motive than that of succeeding in the next election; and so long as this is so it is puerile to expect any interest to deal with it in a spirit different from its own. No doubt when President Hayes assured the Southern States the privileges of self-government within the Union he acted from the purest and highest motives. Could the Southern people have given him political support entirely irrespective of party, we can hardly believe that they would have hesitated in doing it. But they knew very well that behind him was a party carefully ciphering out on their slates how many members of Congress it might gain or lose by his course, and looking on the situation in no other light than that of its effect on their own interests. Such being the case, it was only human to resolve that the calculators should be left to take care of their own interests.

If we look upon the Administration as having no higher hope than that of winning Southern whites over to the Republican party, good advice would be thrown away upon it. An individual who is not only selfish but is not willing to wait for the slow grinding of the mills of God, will never receive much sympathy from any quarter, nor much benefit from good advice; and the moral law is much the same for an organized party as for an individual. But if the party, or its leader, sees some higher problem of statesmanship than that of making the majority vote their own ticket, it will not be difficult to point out some of the conditions of success.

The first thing to be recognized is, that the problem of dealing with the South is a purely practical one. Sentiment has nothing at all to do with the matter, and is nearly as much out of place as passion. We may as well at once make up our minds that any profession of love on our side will do little good, unless we make them feel that it is entirely disinterested and has no relation to politics, which it will be difficult to do under present circumstances. We must throw aside all considerations of love and hate, gratitude and ingratitude, and show them that we are actuated by a regard for sound principles and an honest administration in which no amount of unfriendly feelings on their part can make us waver. A dispassionate adherence to a fixed line of policy, dictated by a regard for the general welfare, modelled so far as possible after the laws of nature, unshaken by threats or blandishments, and persevered in to the end, has a wonderful influence on all men, even the most degraded. Nothing quells passion so surely as resistance by an entirely dispassionate agent. In the Constitution and laws we have such a policy marked out with sufficient precision to serve as a guide under nearly all circumstances. Differences of opinion in matters of detail are, of course, inevitable, but in settling them no better rule can be adopted than to reject the advice of all who are moved by feelings of any kind, whether love, hatred, or passion, and take the advice only of the coolest portion of the community. What is most wanted to cement the Union is a few years of an Administration which shall show neither animosity nor favoritism towards the South, expect neither its opposition nor support, insist on nothing but a due regard to the Constitution and laws on both sides, and wait patiently in calm confidence that the reward of virtue, though long delayed, will surely come at last.

The present Administration has kept about as near to this ideal

as we can expect in the present state of political feeling, and whatever disappointments it may have suffered it has every reason to be satisfied with the result not only to the South but to itself and its party. It has started the South on the only possible road to good government by allowing power to be taken from the hands of reckless adventurers and put into the hands of men who, whatever their shortcomings, represented the intelligence of the community. An element of moral strength has thus been gained which would not have been possible under any other course, and which will the more surely tell in the future the more closely it is imitated by Republicans everywhere. So far as purely party interests are concerned, if the President has not saved his party in the South, he has saved it in the North. Those of its members who complain that it does not command its old majorities should compare its position now with its utter demoralization two years ago, and reflect upon the situation in which it would now be placed if the Stalwarts had then had their own way. The doctrine that in time of peace a State government can be kept in power by Federal bayonets is one which can never receive the sanction of the Northern people, unless under the influence of a gust of feeling. Had the President desired a Democratic successor he could have taken no more effective step to gain his object than that of yielding to the friends of military rule over the South; and whatever the final result may be, it will not be so bad for the party as that course would have proved.

THE PROPOSED AMERICAN INTEROCEANIC CANAL.

THE development of steam navigation made it necessary to cut a ship-canal through the Isthmus of Suez, and the time has arrived when it is equally necessary to create a water-way across the American isthmus. The subject has been discussed periodically for three centuries with great earnestness; and but for the natural obstacles to be overcome and the enormous cost of the work, it would long ago have been completed. Steam traffic between the Atlantic and Pacific oceans has reached the point which ensures an adequate return for the investment of the sum required to complete and maintain an American interoceanic canal, and this, coupled with the necessity for diminishing the cost of carrying the products of our Pacific States to European markets, ensures the construction of a canal within a period of ten or fifteen years. These products, it should be stated here, are not such as can ever be profitably transported across the continent by rail, and there would be no injurious competition between the Pacific railways and an interoceanic canal.

The Suez Canal is simply an exceptionally wide and deep ditch, cut for the most part mechanically through loose sand across a low and nearly uniform section of land. The genius of M. de Lesseps was displayed not in overcoming the forces of nature by engineering triumphs, but in persuading governments, bankers, and individuals to furnish him the money needed to complete the canal. It is a tolerably familiar fact that there was water communication between the Mediterranean and Red Seas, *via* the Nile and a canal, more than three thousand years ago, and there is evidence of the existence of an artificial water-way across the Isthmus of Suez more than four thousand years ago. The engineering problems presented for solution in the construction of an American interoceanic canal are not comparable with those of any similar works in the Old World, and have but few parallels in the United States; they are novel in many particulars, and can only be solved by deliberate study in the light of past experience. There is, therefore, something ludicrous in the assurance with which M. de Lesseps and his associates in the Suez construction arrogantly assume a superior knowledge on all canal questions. A lack of appreciation of the magnitude of the work now about to be undertaken, and an inordinate conceit in his power to overcome all obstacles, are the two most prominent deductions from the recent utterances and acts of this influential personage.

Prior to 1870 our knowledge of the American Isthmus was derived chiefly from the assertions of interested persons and from incomplete surveys, although parts of several routes had been carefully examined. Beyond demonstrating the need of a systematic examination

of the whole Isthmus, and teaching how to provide against climatic and other natural difficulties, very little had been accomplished. The selection for chief of a bureau in the Navy Department of an officer who had given special attention to the canal question, combined with the growing popular interest in the subject, and demand for more rapid sea-transit between our Atlantic and Pacific ports, resulted in the organization, in 1869, of naval exploring parties which spent the six ensuing winters on the Isthmus, and the summers in working up the observations for publication. This labor was persisted in until every probable route had been instrumentally examined and the data prepared for discussion. The service thus rendered by the Navy reflects the greatest credit on the officers engaged in it, and particularly on Commander E. P. Lull, who appears to have been either the chief or the second in command of all but one of the exploring parties. The whole body of data was placed before a commission appointed by the President, by authority of Congress, composed of the Chief of Engineers of the War Department, the Chief of the Coast and Geodetic Survey of the Treasury Department, and the Chief of the Bureau of Navigation of the Navy Department. After careful and deliberate examination of the subject the Commission unanimously reported, in February, 1876:

"That the route known as the Nicaraguan route . . . possesses, both for the construction and maintenance of a canal, greater advantages, and offers fewer difficulties from engineering, commercial, and economic points of view, than any one of the other routes shown to be practicable by surveys sufficiently in detail to enable a judgment to be formed of their relative merits."

This decision will be regarded by all unprejudiced and disinterested persons capable of appreciating the circumstances as finally settling the question as to the best route for a canal. Subsequently, and in apparent ignorance of this decision, and of the extended surveys on which it was based, M. de Lesseps and a few associates advanced a large sum of money and sent parties to explore the Isthmus. During these explorations a concession was granted by the Colombian Government to their agent, who thereupon made an effort to obtain copies of the unpublished data resulting from the United States surveys of the Panama route. These and all other data which the world owes to the United States surveys were ultimately laid before the Congress recently held at Paris, under the auspices of the Geographical Society, by representatives of the United States Government. The meeting had been called ostensibly to discuss the subject and recommend the best route; an examination of the *procès-verbaux* and accompanying documents shows clearly that the Society permitted M. de Lesseps and his associates in the Panama Canal venture to use its name and influence to secure the approval of their scheme, so that the concession they controlled might be utilized. An analysis of the list of members of the Congress shows that of the one hundred and fifteen members seventy-five were self-appointed Frenchmen; of the sixty foreign members five were connected with the Suez Canal, and twelve were given seats by M. de Lesseps. Certainly none of the French members, none of those connected with the Suez Canal, nor any of the members given seats by M. de Lesseps, would be likely to oppose him; the result was a certain majority of sixty-nine votes on any question avowedly advocated by M. de Lesseps. From his opening remarks to his closing address before the Congress and its committees, at social gatherings, in private and in public, he advocated the construction of a canal *at sea-level via* Panama and Aspinwall. The excuse offered for this indecent exercise of his powerful influence was the conviction on his part that a canal with locks was impracticable. So manifest were the advantages of the Nicaragua over all other routes that, in spite of the opposition of M. de Lesseps, the engineers of the Congress had almost reached the point of recommending it, when, on the day before the final sitting, the Panama scheme at sea-level was abandoned by M. de Lesseps and his adherents, and a plan substituted for it in which locks formed the essential feature, and which was founded on an imaginative basis of topography of the Isthmus unwarranted, if not conclusively proved as not existing, by the United States surveys.

Admitting that M. de Lesseps and his associates were sincere in opposing a construction involving locks on account of the time necessary to operate them, is such an objection well founded? The proof that it is not is found in the official reports of the United States Army Engineers in charge of the construction and management of the Des Moines Rapids and Louisville & Portland Canals. It is a satisfaction to us, and might possibly interest our transatlantic friends, to know that there is now near completion at the St. Mary's Falls, between Lakes Superior and Huron, a lock having a length of five hundred and fifteen feet and a lift of eighteen feet; the largest ship canal-lock in the world, through which vessels will be passed in ten minutes.

We do not think it necessary to defend the selection of the Nicaraguan route by the American Commission, composed, as it was, of three men so well fitted to make the selection by their eminent ability, extended experience, and, above all, their freedom from personal prejudice in favor of any one route, against the selection of the Panama route by a packed congress composed chiefly of non-professional members and secretaries of geographical societies practically, if not positively, pledged in advance to advocate and support a certain route because those who had called the congress controlled a favorable concession for using it. A canal at sea-level at Panama is shown to be impracticable by the indisputable facts that such a canal must receive and carry off without injury to itself all the drainage of the Chagres River, and that this river frequently rises over thirty feet in one night. If tunnels are constructed, such a rise would stop traffic by filling them. An open cut would cost five or six times as much as the traffic would warrant, and require an enormous sum to keep it in repair; and if ever completed, the canal would be a financial failure. The official utterances of M. de Lesseps since the Congress adjourned indicate his bewilderment on the economic as well as engineering questions involved. The cost of the canal *via* Panama, as estimated by the *Commission Technique*, was one thousand and forty-four millions of francs, and the time necessary to complete it twelve years. M. de Lesseps has within a short time publicly stated that the same canal can be built for less than five hundred millions of francs in less than five years. He proposes to issue four hundred millions of francs of stock, incur an indebtedness of two hundred millions of francs, guarantee an annual interest of five per cent. pending the construction, and an annual dividend of eleven and a half per cent. after completion. He fails to state the sources of his revenue pending construction, and he admits that the gross revenue of the canal will only be ninety millions of francs. He must, therefore, have in view some novel method of providing for the maintenance of this costly work with one-tenth of one per cent. of the gross annual revenue.

The construction of an American interoceanic canal being necessary to the United States, the economic and political questions involved are of greater importance than any discernible by human foresight in the near future. Wherever and whenever it is constructed it will become the most sensitive and vital part of our interstate and international commercial system, and we must be prepared to protect it from the evils of local revolutions and foreign aggression, to seize it when necessary and successfully defend it against the two greatest naval powers in the world. The completion of such a canal involves, therefore, the creation and maintenance of a naval force in the Atlantic and Pacific capable of contending with that of any possible European combination.

THE COMÉDIE-FRANÇAISE IN LONDON.

LONDON, July 12, 1879.

THE Comédie-Française gives to-night the last representation of its extraordinarily successful series, and I am reminded that I am on the point of losing my opportunity for carrying out an intention long deferred, and making a few remarks upon this very interesting episode of the visit to London of the children of Molière. The first remark to be made is that this visit has been a brilliant, a complete, an unclouded success. It is saying little for it to say that it is incomparably the most noteworthy

event that has occurred for many a long year in the theatrical annals of London: these annals are not so rich as to impart any great force to such a compliment. But what I may say is that the episode will have been a memorable one in the annals of the house of Molière itself. Its members, individually, have refreshed their laurels and renewed their fame, and the beauty and power of the best French acting have affirmed themselves under circumstances which give an added value to the triumph. The appeal has been made to a foreign audience, an audience whose artistic perceptions are the reverse of lively, whose ear does not respond quickly to the magic French utterance, and whose mind does not easily find its way among the intricacies of French sentiment; and yet the triumph has been perfect, and the Comédie-Française and the London public have been thoroughly pleased with each other. I am far from intimating that the Théâtre Français in its collective or ideal capacity has gained in prestige or in dignity by its visit to London and its successful exploitation of English curiosity. This is another question, and there are various things to be said about it. If London has been charmed by this delightful episode, Paris has by no means been affected in the same manner. Parisian irritation has been almost in direct proportion to English applause. It is hardly too much to say that Parisian opinion has been to a certain point scandalized. The conservative view of the case is easy to understand, and (inconsistent as the declaration may appear) it wholly commands my sympathy. In this view the Comédie-Française has no right to detach itself from French soil; it is beneath its dignity to wander off to foreign lands like a troupe of common strollers, to fill its cash-box and make barbarians stare. If it leaves Paris it should betake itself to some other French city; it should speak only to French-speaking audiences; it should find a temporary home at Lyons, at Marseilles, at Bordeaux. Indeed, in the view of many fastidious spirits, the Comédie-Française should not think too much about the cash-box at all. It should enjoy its copious subvention; it should live in comfort and credit; but it should never propose to itself to make money. It should never, as the French say, *courir les aventures*. Such vulgar ambitions are for other companies—they are not for the house of Molière, which belongs to the Gallic soil, to the climate, to the atmosphere, and has as little right to absent itself as the French Academy or the Chamber of Deputies would have to hold their sittings in neighboring states. The pretext of this brilliant escapade on the part of an austere institution was the undertaking of certain repairs and embellishments in the great theatre of the Rue de Richelieu, where it must be confessed that some such labors had long been urgently needed. The house was to be put in order, the theatre was to be closed for six weeks. It was decided to spend these six weeks in London, and a rich pecuniary harvest was guaranteed beforehand. The Comédie assumed no risks, and no one connected with the enterprise can have been a loser—not even the tattered persons, of both sexes, whose share in it has been to thrust the play-book into the windows of the long train of carriages slowly advancing to the Gaiety Theatre. This is all very well; but if I were a consistent Parisian I should be no better pleased. I have spent as many evenings at the Gaiety Theatre as I have found possible, and I have always enjoyed my privilege; but, distinctly, the institution which I just spoke of as austere has lost to my eyes a part of that sanctity in which it was formerly clad. I have enjoyed it in London, but I am afraid that in case of paying it a visit in Paris I shall not enjoy it so much. I have seen it out of its element—I have seen it in the Strand! I have seen it vulgarized, reduced to the level of ordinary commercial ventures, departing from its traditions and compromising with its ideal. I don't know a more striking example of the spirit of the age, of the march of a civilization before which old scruples and reserves, old sentiments and sanctities are successively toppling over.

But of course if the Comédie-Française was willing, we were only too delighted, and I must restrict myself to talking of our charming impressions. It is true that we have talked of them a great deal already—a certain section of the London world may be said for the last five weeks to have talked of nothing else. It had found a topic, and in a community addicted to dinner-giving a topic has precious uses. Indeed, there came a time when the Comédie-Française threatened to take rank with the weather, or with Mrs. Langtry, as a subject available only for persons who had resigned themselves to the apparent sacrifice of originality. I almost feel tempted to say that the most entertaining part of the episode has been the performances, not of the Comédie, but of the audience. The Théâtre-Français, as exhibited to London society, is one branch of the affair; London society, as exhibiting itself to the Théâtre-Français, is another. The most amusing comedians have not always been before the footlights, and the drama has gone on in the world as well as on the

stage. The whole thing, on the part of the public, has been very characteristic, very English—the Parisian mind would probably say very provincial. I shall not attempt, however, to go into details on this point—it is enough to say that the hospitality of the London world has been extreme and complete. The Comédie-Française has been "taken up," collectively and individually, with a warmth which must have taxed the preconceptions of the French imagination, and which does great honor to English courtesy. How the French imagination may have reconciled all this—especially in some of its phases—with the familiar traditions about English stiffness and coldness, English prudery and false delicacy, it profits not to enquire. It is enough that it must occasionally have been sorely puzzled, and have carried away a considerable store of tough problems, to be solved at leisure. One of these, for instance, will be connected, as we may surmise, with the extraordinary vogue of Mademoiselle Sarah Bernhardt, and will concern itself with enquiring into the sources of the tender interest excited by this lady. I speak of her "vogue" for want of a better word; it would require some ingenuity to give an idea of the intensity, the ecstasy, the insanity as some people would say, of curiosity and enthusiasm provoked by Mlle. Bernhardt. I spoke just now of topics, and what they were worth in the London system. This remarkable actress has filled this function with a completeness that leaves nothing to be desired; her success has been altogether the most striking and curious, although by no means, I think, the most gratifying, incident of the visit of the Comédie. It has not been the most gratifying, because it has been but in a very moderate degree an artistic success. It has been the success of a celebrity, pure and simple, and Mlle. Sarah Bernhardt is not, to my sense, a celebrity because she is an artist. She is a celebrity because, apparently, she desires with an intensity that has rarely been equalled to be one, and because for this end all means are alike to her. She may flatter herself that, as regards the London public, she has compassed her end with a completeness which makes of her a sort of fantastically impertinent *victrix* poised upon a perfect pyramid of ruins—the ruins of a hundred British prejudices and proprieties. Mlle. Sarah Bernhardt has remarkable gifts; her success is something quite apart, as the woman herself is something quite apart; but her triumph has little to do with the proper lines of the Comédie-Française. She is a child of her age—of her moment—and she has known how to profit by the idiosyncrasies of the time. The trade of a celebrity, pure and simple, had been invented. I think, before she came to London; if it had not been, it is certain that she would have discovered it. She has in a supreme degree what the French call the *génie de la réclame*—the advertising genius; she may, indeed, be called the muse of the newspaper. Brilliantly as she had already exercised her genius, her visit to London has apparently been a revelation to her of the great extension it may obtain among the Anglo-Saxon peoples, and the dénouement of this latest chapter in the history of the Comédie-Française is that Mlle. Sarah Bernhardt has resigned her place as *sociétaire*. You will, of course, have heard long before this reaches you that she has formed projects, more or less definite, for visiting the United States. I strongly suspect that she will find a triumphant career in the Western world. She is too American not to succeed in America. The people who have brought to the highest development the arts and graces of publicity will recognize a kindred spirit in a figure so admirably adapted for conspicuity. Mlle. Bernhardt will be a loss to the Comédie-Française, but she will not be a fatal one. Charming as are some of her gifts, peculiar and picturesque as is her whole artistic personality, it cannot in the least be said that she is a consummate actress, or even what the French call a real *comédienne*. She is far from belonging to the race of Rachel and Desclée, she has something sceptical and cynical which was wholly foreign to the manner of those concentrated and serious artists. There are, indeed, actresses now at the Théâtre-Française who are very much more complete than Mlle. Sarah Bernhardt. Mlle. Favart knows her trade as her more youthful and more captivating successor will probably never pretend to do. But unfortunately Mlle. Favart lacks charms; she pleases no one but the people whose judgment is complicated by an appreciation of technicalities. It is to be added that Mlle. Sarah Bernhardt's repertory is a singularly narrow and disadvantageous one; in a single part, in "Phèdre" alone, has she a chance to give the measure of a great talent. The plaintive and pathetic passages of "Phèdre" she renders with admirable delicacy and grace; but in the violent scenes she forces her note beyond all reason, and becomes painfully shrill and modern. Her only other opportunity is in the last act of "Hernani," which apparently has been her great success in London. In "Ruy Blas" her part is pale and savorless, and in "L'Étrangère" it is an almost grotesquely

bad one. In "Zaire" she has failed in London to make her mark; and in "Andromaque" she has little or nothing to do but to assume the attitude of a weeping willow, rustling and murmuring in melancholy zephyrs. This it must be confessed, however, she does to perfection.

Her rival, Mademoiselle Croizette, has obtained a very much scantier share of the public favor, and this lady's failure to please the English public has been, I believe, for the administration of the Comédie-Française, one of the surprises of the visit to London. This accident will have been less of a surprise to many spectators; yet I nevertheless think that Mlle. Croizette has not received her due. She has the misfortune of lacking a certain indispensable delicacy of interest, and it must be added that the amplitude of her person has reached a point at which, in the parts of young girls, illusion tends to vanish. But Mlle. Croizette is a very handsome woman and a very vigorous and definite actress, and it would have been in the interest of ideal justice that English applause should have been rather more equally divided between the most eminent of the younger ladies of the Comédie-Française. As regards the elder ones, we have had the entertainment—and found it an excellent one—of seeing Madeleine Brohan and Mademoiselle Favart in the parts of mothers and aunts. The latter lady, in consenting to undertake the representation of maturity and maternity, has opened for herself a fresh and honorable career; and nothing can be more charming, more brilliant and picturesque, than Madeleine Brohan's evocation of the old *Marquise de Villemer*, in George Sand's agreeable drama of that name. The striking thing in London, however, as it has long been in Paris, is the great superiority of the masculine side of the house. The great trio of Got, Delaunay, Coquelin, is unapproached, and from present appearances unapproachable, by any feminine combination. Each of these great actors has won himself large honors with the English public; each of them has done with a rich perfection that which he has had to do. If I were to put forward one of these artists rather than another as the source of my own highest pleasure, I think I should have little hesitation in naming the rich, the rare, the admirable and inimitable Coquelin. There was a time when I thought Got the first of living actors, and Got is certainly still a consummate, a superb comedian. But as Coquelin has advanced in life and in his art, he has attained a command of his powers and developed an intelligence of the whole dramatic mystery which place him, to my sense, almost alone. His variety, his versatility, the extent of his scale, are extraordinary; he is at once the most joyous and exuberant of pure comedians and the most powerful and touching of serious actors. He has a deeper intelligence than is often seen upon the stage; he strikes at once the note of high comicality and the note of passion, of deep seriousness; and he does both of these things with a certain touching, moving, exciting ardor. I said just now that Mlle. Sarah Bernhardt was supposed to be going to America. That is all very well; but what I really wish is that M. Coquelin would go.

XX.

THE KHEDIVES DEPOSITION.

CAIRO, July 5, 1879.

THE forced abdication of the Khedive in favor of his eldest son has been effected so quietly that but few persons out of Egypt are aware how near we came to having very serious times here. It is well known that when the question of the abdication first came up the Porte was strongly in favor of the succession of Halim Pasha, the late Khedive's uncle, now living in exile in Paris, who, according to the old system of succession, would have succeeded Saïd Pasha in 1863. The late Khedive had told Shaim Pasha, the Minister of War, that if Halim Pasha, or any person other than one of his own sons, should be designated as his successor, he would fight. He added, moreover, that the present state of affairs was such that the chances were that no European power would care to go to the expense of sending a force to conquer Egypt as soon as it was known that there would be a serious resistance. Military preparations were scarcely pushed forward, and in three weeks about one hundred thousand men could have been put into the field well equipped and passably well disciplined.

On Wednesday, June 25, at three o'clock in the morning, the Consul-General of England and France called at the palace and demanded the immediate abdication of the Khedive. The Khedive asked them what guarantee would be given as to the succession of one of his sons. Upon the reply that Tewfik Pasha, his eldest son, would succeed, but that they were not prepared to give any guarantees, the Khedive refused to consider the question of abdication any further at that early hour in the

morning, and referred them to the Sultan. Wednesday and Thursday the scene was transferred to Constantinople, where the representatives of the Powers had their hands full in making the Porte realize the folly of persisting in the succession of Halim Pasha. On Thursday noon their efforts were crowned with success. The Porte agreed to accept Tewfik Pasha, and a telegram was sent to that young prince declaring him Khedive of Egypt. The new Khedive, who is only in his twenty-fifth year, went at once to embrace his father, who congratulated him on his succession to the throne, and held his first reception at the Citadel in Cairo on Thursday afternoon, and all was quietly settled. Tewfik has been very carefully educated, and speaks Persian, Turkish, Arabic, French, and English. Although, with the exception of ten days in Vienna, he has never spent any time out of Egypt, nevertheless he is more liberal and more European in his views than any of his brothers. His chief adviser is Sherif Pasha, who has been President of the Council of Ministers since the fall of the Nubar-Wilson-De Blignières Ministry.

Ismail Pasha, accompanied by his two sons, Hussein and Hassan, left here for Naples on June 30. At the departure the scene of separation was most impressive. Under a personal government almost every individual of any importance has some special and perhaps confidential relations with the sovereign; and when the ministers and functionaries and employes came in turn to bid farewell to him who had been their sole master for sixteen years, there was scarcely a countenance in the vast crowd that was not moved to tears. Ismail Pasha alone remained apparently unmoved, and received the homage of those about him with the same grace and dignity which characterized his receptions when at the height of his splendor. The shrieks and cries of the harems were simply indescribable. The women tore their hair and put dust on their heads, and the scene was most painful. At five o'clock in the afternoon Ismail Pasha embarked on board his beautiful steam-yacht, the *Maroussa*. From the immobility of his expression one could scarcely realize that his highness was about to leave his country for ever. He had for every one an affectionate word, and told those who begged to accompany him that by rendering as good service to Tewfik Pasha as they had rendered him they would please him best.

The result of all this is not deemed so encouraging by European residents here as it seems to be in Europe. One khedive has been changed for another, and two countries, France and England, propose virtually to administer the country. Whether they can do this in face of the obstacles of religion and prejudice of race in Egypt itself, and in face of the jealousy and the rights and privileges which other European Powers have obtained by treaty, remains to be seen, and will form the subject of another letter.

FRANCE AND ENGLAND IN EGYPT.

PARIS, JULY 8, 1879.

IT would be difficult to explain the singular attraction which the land of the Pharaohs has so long had for France. Bonaparte's expedition to Egypt was perhaps the origin of it, though it was, on the whole, unsuccessful, and ended in a disastrous capitulation. This expedition was conceived, at the time, as an indirect attack on England; but it was a mere incident in the revolutionary wars. The savants who accompanied Bonaparte came back with many notes on Egypt, and the result of their labors is still preserved in a monumental work. The fashion became Egyptian. Heads of sphinxes became a common ornament, and marked the transition from the style of Louis XV. to the hideous style called the "Empire." The discoveries made in the valley of the Nile opened new horizons to history, to philology; and though these discoveries have been much extended since, it is certain that the expedition to Egypt was, in a scientific sense, almost a revolution.

There was no Egyptian question till France conquered Algiers. This conquest, provoked by the insolence of the Bey of Algeria and by the depredations of the Algerian privateers, was the first blow to the power of Turkey and of the great Sultan in Africa. French influence had always been felt in Syria, in Lebanon, at Jerusalem. There was a Levantine population at Alexandria and at Smyrna. The French element was important in these towns, and enjoyed the benefit of the *capitulations*—that is, of the consular jurisdiction. When Mehemet Ali made himself independent France naturally became his ally and protector. Egypt at that time threatened to become very formidable. The new sovereign of Egypt attempted to tear Syria from the hands of Turkey; the "Quadruple Alliance" put an end to his dreams; Lord Palmerston contrived to unite all the great Powers against Mehemet Ali and against France. You can read in the memoirs of M. Guizot and in those of Charles Greville how the in-

trigue of the Quadruple Alliance was conducted under the eyes of M. Guizot, who had gone to London as ambassador. Guizot was an Anglo-maniac. He was *enguirlandé*, to use a favorite Russian expression, by the English aristocracy, and Lord Palmerston was able to unite all Europe against the cabinet of M. Thiers, who was then Prime Minister. Louis Philippe had to choose between peace and war, and war with all Europe—war for a Mussulman pasha. He wisely chose peace, and made a composition with Europe in virtue of which Mehemet Ali lost his ephemeral conquests in Asia, but the possession of Egypt was guaranteed to him and to his family. The rulers of Egypt were still kept dependent on the great Sultan. They had to pay a tribute; but Egypt became autonomous and practically independent.

France is accustomed to go to war "for an idea." In 1840 she did not actually go to war, but she incurred great dangers, and we were obliged to put our army on a war-footing. France actually gained nothing substantial from her great efforts in favor of Mehemet Ali, except perhaps the "obelisk" of Luxor, which now adorns the Place de la Concorde. Under the rule of Mehemet Ali and his family Egypt might have developed quietly her vast resources. It would be unjust to say she has not partly done so; unfortunately, much evil has been mixed up with partial good. The two last rulers especially, Said Pasha and Ismail Pasha, have been only too much civilized; they seem to have been able to combine and to marry all the vices of an old and effete civilization with those of a barbarous state. The diffusion of knowledge among the people, a just and moderate taxation, a good administration of justice—all the real objects of a high civilization have been utterly neglected by them: the *fellah* is as ignorant, as submissive, as wretched now as he could have been under the rule of the Pharaohs; the system of taxation is as barbarous now as then, the tithes are collected in kind, the bastinado seems to be considered as a necessary process for the collection of imposts; the taxes are often levied before they are due. Altogether, the Egyptian khedives have treated their people as unmercifully as a pasha sent from Constantinople to Asia Minor, to Damascus, or to Bassorah. It was thought, and it seemed natural to think, that an unlimited tenure of power would calm and subdue the lust of plunder in the hearts of the Egyptian rulers. The pashas of Bagdad have a fortune to make in a few years; the fortune of the Khedive was already made.

The members of the family of Mehemet Ali, coming from a semi-barbarous stock, were only able to see in civilization what is material and visible; they could build palaces and fill them with treasures; they could buy costly furniture, chosen without any reference to art; they could encourage science, if science brought from the earth something visible—inscriptions, monuments, sphinxes, rings, amulets; they could encourage art, if art spoke to the senses. Verdi was commissioned to write his opera of "Aïda" for the theatre built by Ismail Pasha; the new Pharaoh gave himself the amusement of seeing, so to speak, the ancient Pharaohs revive under his eyes. But he was not contented with the noble music of Verdi, even if the singers were adorned with real diamonds and rubies; he wanted something more *civilized*—it was his pride to be looked upon as a Parisian. Hortense Schneider was obliged to go and sing the "Grande Duchesse" on the shores of the Nile. The *opérette* was at home in Cairo; the songs of the "Bouffes-Parisiens" and of the "Palais Royal" became popular in Egypt. Journalists were hired to go to Egypt, were hospitably treated and made to sing the praises of the new rulers of Egypt. Even books were written in their honor. I am not sure that Edmond About, the author of "Tolla" and of the "Roi des Montagnes," is not the author of a volume called "The Fellah." Prévost-Paradol made a pleasure trip on the Nile on a Government steamer. The hospitality of the Khedive was boundless; life at the Windsor Palace, in the Burg of Vienna, even in the Summer Palace or Winter Palace of the Czar, is tame compared to what it was in the oriental palaces of Ismail.

The Khedive was not only a most generous host, he was not content to draw to Egypt the celebrities of Europe; he really believed himself to be a man of progress. But he could only understand progress in the material sense. He could interest himself in canals, in railways, in works of irrigation, in machines, in sugar-factories; he became the largest landlord in the world, by the very simple means of confiscation or of buying at his own price. He possessed, together with his own family, about one-fifth of the cultivable part of Egypt. He was, with all his civilized airs, more absolute than the King of Dahomey. If he had been a good man of business his rule, strange as it was, would probably have benefited Egypt in the end. The opening of the Suez Canal is a benefit which cannot well be forgotten. Unfortun-

ately the Khedive contrived to spoil everything by his bad management; he was never satisfied, he was a schemer as full of projects as a man who has his fortune to make. When the American war of secession broke out he began to grow cotton, and for a few years the speculation was a good one; now the cotton-plantations of Egypt have become almost worthless. It was the same with his sugar-factories. He looked after every detail, and in the number of the details he completely lost sight of the whole. The whole was the budget of Egypt; after a number of years spent in civilizing, Egypt found herself hopelessly ruined. Credit had been the chief instrument of the Khedive; he had soon perceived that he need not be long the prey of the Levantine bankers; he found in London and Paris a host of easy and complacent lenders. There was a halo about Egypt, the Isthmus of Suez, the civilizing Khedive, which was very favorable to speculation. Who would not assist the great man who loved France so much that he even valued the French *op'rette*? The savings of France began to find their way to Egypt. A great institution, called the "Crédit Foncier," was instituted under Napoleon III. for the protection of French agriculture. This bank, which has a capital of 40,000,000 francs, makes loans to our farmers and landlords at a moderate rate. The bonds of the Crédit Foncier, having the guarantee of a first mortgage on land, are good securities; but the directors of this establishment thought that they might encourage agriculture in Egypt, and so they did. The Crédit Foncier holds now about 160,000,000 of Egyptian securities (francs). The loans made to the Khedive by this great establishment were made with the capital of French depositors; the directors have since been blamed and changed, but there remains the disagreeable fact that an immense sum is due by Egypt to a French establishment which is under Government control, and the director of which is appointed by the Minister of Finance. There is besides in Paris what is called a "great Syndicate" of bankers and banking-houses which have between them about 80,000,000 of Egyptian securities.

You see that the Egyptian question has become for our financial world a question of the highest importance. A short time before he fell from power the Khedive had contracted a new loan with the greatest financial house in the world, guaranteed by his own domains and by the domains of his family. The English and French Governments have been placed by all these circumstances in a somewhat difficult position. They have always refused to give their formal guarantee to any of the loans contracted by the Khedive; at the same time they have assumed a great share of responsibility in the management of the Egyptian finances, by the continued interference of the consuls and the defence of the claims of the creditors of the Khedive, and by the direct interference in the administration of Egypt through Nubar Pasha, MM. Rivers Wilson and De Blignières. This last cabinet was, in fact, an Anglo-French cabinet imposed on the Khedive; the Khedive dismissed it, but he fell soon afterwards himself, without noise, without difficulty, at the first intimation of Europe.

What will come next? Europe chose to use the hand of the Sultan to give the last blow to the Khedive, but everybody understands that the revolution in Cairo was not the work of the Sultan; it was the work of Europe. Directly, or indirectly, France and England have undertaken to administer Egypt and its finances. They are afraid themselves of this *condominium*; they know the danger of any *condominium*. That is the reason why they screen their action behind the action of the Porte, and why they are not sorry to see the Austrian and the German associate their action with the Anglo-French action. On the whole, the fall of the Khedive has not much simplified matters; the change of one man will not, at least for the present, improve the state of the Egyptian finances, and the circumstances of his fall will allow fresh combinations in European politics which may become dangerous. It seems to me probable that Turkey will soon be thrown into the hands of Russia; that Austria and Germany, who are completely tied now, will favor the Anglo-French *condominium* in Egypt, in the hope that it will bring on the difficulties which are inseparable from a common action of two Powers in a distant country and for separate interests.

Correspondence.

BI-METALLISM IN EUROPE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: I infer from some recent remarks in the *Nation* upon ex-Secretary McCulloch's Harvard lectures that there is a notion prevailing in America

that Europe, and especially England, is coming to take a more favorable view of bi-metallic money. Having been at some pains recently, both in London and Paris, to sound the depths of the so-called "silver movement," I feel justified in saying that there is no such movement—that is, no *new* movement. The resolutions of the Liverpool Chamber of Commerce were promptly negatived at Manchester, and they never produced a ripple in London. After diligent search in the latter city I could find no movement in reference to silver except a languid discussion of the expediency of bi-metallism in India. Even this, which can hardly be called a silver movement, was extremely faint and inconsequential. One gentleman of eminence in the financial world was quoted as having changed his opinions and being prepared to take a favorable view of silver as full legal-tender, but this gentleman was not quoted as in any way active or as constituting a movement. I became convinced that the depreciation of the rupee, so far from inclining England to adopt a bi-metallic currency for her own uses, was having the opposite effect, and that if silver became as cheap as tin she would cling only the tighter to the sovereign.

In Paris there is absolutely no silver movement, except the agitation which M. Cernuschi keeps on foot from his princely residence on the Pare Monceaux. This agitation is not confined to any one country or continent, and it is less effective in France than in England or the United States. M. Cernuschi, by the way, is not favorably impressed by the Warner Bill. Indeed, he esteems the supporters of that measure the worst enemies of bi-metallism in the world, and he thinks that the United States by coining silver dollars are postponing the triumph of the principles which he espouses, by making the burdens of Europe lighter by two millions per month.

As to Germany, I cannot speak with the same confidence as with reference to England and France—not having visited Berlin as yet. I have been informed, however, by persons whose business it is to keep *au courant* with the subject, that not only has the German Government no intention of changing her new gold standard for a bi-metallic one, but such a change is deemed impossible, and therefore not worth wasting words about.

The indifference of the world does not prove anything, in the forum of reason, against the bi-metallists. They believe that there is not gold enough in the world to answer the monetary needs of mankind, and that some more can be added by joint resolution. They may be right, but we shall probably never know till the last day. The only purpose of this note is to disabuse the minds of your readers of the impression, if it exists, that a change has come over the public mind of Europe since the failure of the Paris Conference in August of last year.

HORACE WHITE.

WIEB-ADEN, July 10, 1879.

THEOLOGY IN COLLEGES.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: As a clergyman, I have been much interested in your recent articles upon the teachings of theology in colleges. If, as the *Nation* seems to intimate, it is impossible for theology to be taught under the auspices of a university, I should be glad to know it, that I may advise my young friends to seek some other profession where their education *can* be that of a university. If, of all the liberal arts, theology alone cannot be taught with the single purpose of discovering the truth concerning it, I think the public would be glad to know it, that it may once for all discard theology from its concerns. If of all the departments hitherto covered by a university training, Harvard College, which is called a university, feels itself incompetent to provide for any particular one, whether theology, or natural science, or medicine, I am sure many graduates of Harvard College besides the ministers would be glad to know it, that they may make the University worthier of its name. In a word, if while all other education in these days is becoming broad and catholic, theological education alone must remain provincial, it behooves us all to understand the reasons.

Whatever may be said on this question, the simple fact remains that theology is, and has always been, one of the branches of sound learning; and this being the case, the university is bound to embrace it in its course or else show reason why it does not. That theology has hitherto been taught in a narrow or partisan spirit is no concern of the university whatever. So has Greek, for that matter; and so is political economy taught to-day in half our schools and colleges. The attitude of the university is, that whatever can be taught at all *can* be taught without par-

tianship, else university training is a myth or a misnomer. If it be charged that where theology is taught in this way only one sect will accept its instruction, the duty of the university still remains the same. When Harvard College begins to decide what it shall teach, or how it shall teach it, by the political or religious prejudices of the community, it is time for it to close its doors. Harvard College is offering agricultural instruction to-day without regard to the prejudices of New England farmers. That New England farmers do not value it, or will not accept it, may starve the Bussey department out, but is no reason why the Bussey experiment should not be tried.

For some strange reason it seems to be held against the Harvard Divinity School that it succeeds in training ministers for a particular denomination. I am not aware that any such charge against a law or medical school would be considered fatal. If any special community preferred university-educated lawyers or doctors to others, or even Cambridge-educated ones to New York or Philadelphia-educated, this would show the taste of the community, but would not affect the duty of the university. If Unitarian churches prefer university-taught theology, no Unitarian has cause to blush, and Harvard University may simply rejoice that there is one sect that appreciates its theological wares. Fortunately there are many indications just now that other denominations are forming the same taste.

I argue on the assumption that theology *can* be taught without partisanship: at least with as little partisanship as any branch of study where different conclusions are possible. It would be difficult to prove, and certainly the present discussion has not shown, that theology differs on this point from the other sciences, in any other way save that theological prejudices and prepossessions are more deeply rooted than any other. But this only argues the greater need of university training. This is what universities are for. To divorce theological education from the great centres of learning, as the *Nation* suggests, and turn it over to the sects in their out-of-the-way corners of the student's world, is deliberately to doom theology to narrowness.

I notice that in this discussion, as in others of the kind, the analogy between theology and such branches as political economy and medicine is conveniently ignored as having nothing to do with the question. It has everything to do with the question; and when the *Nation* can show that because political economy means to the world at large free-trade or protection, mono-metallism or bi-metallism, or because no good teacher of political economy can fail to have convictions on these points, therefore political economy may not be taught in a university, it will be time to demand that theology be banished on the same grounds. To most of us this is the best reason why the university should undertake the one and the other; and for Harvard College to refuse to attempt it seems not a noble unsectarianism but an ignoble abdication of the university's true responsibility.

The *Nation* is anxious to have its correspondents define "non-sectarian theology." Excuse me, but this is the very thing which we look to the university to do. My Catholic neighbor would like very much to have me define "non-sectarian history." I decline the attempt myself, but send him to Cambridge to find out. If he still complains that his son is taught anti-Catholic history, I say so much the worse for Cambridge, which ought to know how, or to find out how, to teach history undenominationally, whether its professors are Protestant or Catholic. If there are difficulties in the way it is a poor university that cannot overcome difficulties of teaching.

But really I cannot see the difficulties here which seem to the *Nation* so portentous. It thinks such questions as the Trinity, the Nature of Christ, the Atonement, etc., must be taught in a sectarian way or not at all. But why? No one disputes that a doctrine of the Trinity is held in the Church. The question is where it came from and what are its claims? Is it part of primitive Christianity, or has it grown out of primitive Christianity by processes which can be historically traced; or even if part of early Christianity, was it the teaching of all the founders, or of only one or two of them? These are questions of historic fact to be decided by the study of ancient documents and of the writings of two or three centuries. If the *Nation* discovers any respect in which these differ from other historical facts, or any point at which a scholarly and independent mind cannot view and teach them on their merits, it is bound to make its discovery known. The case is essentially the same with the other doctrines alluded to. Even when the ultimate question arises, whether Christianity itself demands any other acceptance for its facts or teachings than reason accords to all other facts or truths, this does not differ in the least from ordinary questions of logic and philoso-

phy. If any claim that it does, it is for them to prove how it does. If it is urged that theology never has been taught in this way, I can only reply that it is quite time it should be, and that in no place can it be more properly attempted than in our oldest and largest university.

As for Unitarians, so far as I may speak for them, let me assure the *Nation* that whenever such absolutely unsectarian theology as this is offered at scholarly hands, they, as a sect, will be perfectly satisfied, and will not enquire whether the teacher be orthodox or heretic, if they are the only ones to be satisfied. I still insist that this is not a matter for the university to consider. It has offered thorough training to theologians; and there its responsibility ceases.

E. H. H.

WORCESTER, MASS., July 18, 1879.

[It would have saved trouble if "E. H. H." had defined his meaning in speaking of "theology." If he means "natural theology"—that is, the proof of the existence of a benevolent creator from the order of the universe—we have said already that we do not see how a university can avoid teaching it. But if he means Christian theology—that is, the religion revealed by the Bible and Church traditions—he ought to have informed us how this theology is to be taught in a non-sectarian form, for this is what the present discussion is about. It is "non-sectarian theology" which the Harvard Divinity School is, we are told, going to teach, and, as well as we can make out, "E. H. H." sees no more difficulty in teaching it than in teaching political economy or agriculture. This is something rather odd, coming from a minister, for he knows that the great majority of the Christian world hold not only that certain theological beliefs are essential to a man's eternal happiness, but that they contain the sources of his morality in this life. Unitarians and Universalists may not hold this, but then it is admitted that Harvard University is not intended for the exclusive use of Unitarians and Universalists, so that their readiness to accept "non-sectarian theology" does not meet the emergency. He knows also that this is not true of economical or agricultural opinions. No father thinks his son will be damned eternally or suffer in character if he does not believe in free trade, or in a high tariff, or entertains singular views about manures or the rotation of crops. "E. H. H." also appears to assume that the theological professor will have no more serious duty regarding the Trinity, for instance, than tracing the history of the dogma. But we can hardly believe that we understand him rightly. A professor of ecclesiastical history might possibly by very careful steering confine himself to this; but think of a professor in a divinity school, in talking to his students about the Trinity and the Atonement, evading the question, "Are these doctrines true, as held by the great body of Christians both Catholic and Protestant?" Think of his telling his class that they might believe them or not, just as they pleased! What Christian father would like to have his son instructed in this way on such matters? What honorable father would like to have his son educated at an institution in which a body of professors was engaged in communicating information on such themes without letting their own views be known? If we were to take "E. H. H.'s" language literally, we should conclude that what he meant by theology was what is called the "science of religion," in which Christianity is put in the same category with fetishism, Buddhism, and Mohammedanism, and all religion is treated as simply a form of human expression, like art or language, and to be studied in a spirit of pure criticism. But, then, this is not what President Eliot proposes, or what the contributors to the new endowment fund have in mind. Moreover, a professor who taught this successfully would have almost necessarily to be a sceptic. The true way out of the difficulty is, it seems to us, if the University must teach theology, to set up, frankly and candidly, as they do in Germany, an orthodox Protestant faculty, and a Unitarian faculty, and a Catholic faculty, and let the student suit himself. But do not let us assume that there is an essence of theology which can be served out in a harmless form, and which each denomination can afterwards flavor and dilute to suit itself.—ED. NATION.]

THE DANGER OF DIVINITY SCHOOLS.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE NATION:

SIR: Was it not rather rash in an experienced editor to print the following sentence?

"We shall be glad to receive from Dr. Clarke a definition of 'non-sectarian theology,' describing in detail the manner in which it is taught and the view it takes of such questions as the Atonement, the Trinity, Original Sin, Future Punishment, the Nature of Sacraments, the Relation between Faith and Works, and telling us whether the chair or chairs from which it is to be taught in the Harvard Divinity School can or will be filled by Congregationalists, or Episcopalians, or anybody but Unitarians. Some explanation of this sort is due both to the subscribers to the endowment, and to parents throughout the country who are asked to consider the college undenominational."

By this cordial invitation you open your columns to a description "in detail" of the mode of teaching six important doctrines. To do this in the way you desire would require some five or six articles in successive numbers of the *Nation*, each occupying, perhaps, a page in your paper. Would you like, on the whole, as much theology as this? But I will not take advantage of the rare moments in which a good editor may nod. Though you ask for details on all these great theological questions; though you tell me that I am bad at a *résumé*, and thus indicate your wish to have an argument rather than a summary, processes rather than results, I shall try to limit myself to the essential points in your paragraph.

1. What is non-sectarian theology?

A theology which is not confined to the limits of any sect, nor taught in the interests of any sect, may be called, I suppose, a non-sectarian theology. If the teachers of theology are not bound by any creed, nor subject to the criticism of any sect, but are free to enquire, to change their views, and to say freely what they believe, they are non-sectarian teachers.

2. Is there any non-sectarian theology?

It would be safe to say, in reply, that there is no sectarian theology. No sect, as far as I know, has a theology peculiar to itself. Each one shares its views with others, and contains a large range of opinion within itself. I never heard of a theology which belonged exclusively to any sect. Even what is called the Unitarian view of the Trinity is held substantially by four or five different denominations.

3. Is Harvard Divinity School non-sectarian?

A recent article in the *Christian Register*, evidently written by one in close connection with the Divinity School, makes the following statements:

(a) The foundation of the Divinity School declares that "no assent to the peculiarities of any denomination of Christians shall be required, either of the instructors or students."

(b) As a matter of fact, students are encouraged to examine both sides of every theological question. They are free to defend orthodox views of the Trinity, Atonement, etc., in their essays, sermons, and discussions. They often do defend them. The writer refers to instances in which orthodox students have entered the school, have maintained orthodox opinions in their sermons and lectures, and, after graduating, have entered the orthodox ministry. The students are encouraged and taught to read the leading works on both sides of each important question.

(c) Prof. Ezra Abbot (who probably stands at the head among the professors of textual criticism in this country) teaches at Cambridge exactly as he would at Princeton. The Professor of Ecclesiastical History at Cambridge has more than once publicly expressed his satisfaction with the definition of the Trinity, not as given in the Athanasian Creed, but as really taught by Athanasius himself. No one suspects the Professor of Hebrew Language and Literature of teaching *that* in a sectarian way. The same may be said of the teaching of theism, of ethics, and of the ethnic religions.

Harvard Divinity School is, therefore, already to a large extent non-sectarian by its statutes and foundation: by the encouragement given to students to examine both sides of important questions; by the largest liberty given them in their essays, discussions, and preaching; by there being no doctrinal tests for students or professors, and by its having in its chairs men of too much insight and breadth to narrow their minds to any sectarian limits. To make it wholly non-sectarian it is only necessary to have other professorships established, to be filled by eminent men of different denominations. And this is exactly what we all wish to have done, and what President Eliot is preparing to do.

4. How can a non-sectarian theology be taught at Harvard?

It can be taught by having professorships endowed by different de-

nominations, to be filled by their best men; by having professors who are themselves superior to any sectarian bias, and by having an instruction deep enough to go below the common sectarian controversies. You seem to assume that there are only *two* sides to such doctrines as the Trinity or the Atonement. But, in fact, there are many different views to be taken of them. Serious study disposes of most sectarian definitions by rejecting all of them. It finds truth and error in all creeds. It advances by means of new statements and broader generalization. No theologians of any party in New England would accept either the orthodox or the heterodox views of the Atonement which were generally held two hundred years ago. No Calvinist now accepts Calvinism pure and simple. In proportion as a man is a real scholar he *must* teach an unsectarian theology.

The purpose of endowing new chairs in the Harvard Divinity School is to enable the corporation to secure the ablest men from all quarters, men who, because able, are usually liberal. Such men will be welcome there, no matter from what denomination they come.

5. You say that "a large body of Christian parents" believe Harvard University "to be a hot-bed of Unitarianism."

This may have been true twenty or thirty years ago, but it is too late now to attempt to alarm any one with this phantom. Parents who wish to send their children to Harvard know perfectly well that no sectarianism exists in the University; that its professors and students are of all denominations; that the University provides seats for the students in any church they desire to attend; and that the Divinity School is wholly apart from the academic department. So long as classes of two hundred or more enter college we may be sure that there is no cause for the anxiety you feel on this subject.

Though I have not answered "in detail" all your questions, for which I have not time nor you space, I think I have sufficiently indicated the answer which may be given to them.

JAMES FREEMAN CLARKE.

JAMAICA PLAIN, MASS., July 23.

[We are not so rash or so simple as Dr. Clarke supposes. We are so confident that anybody who undertakes to describe "non-sectarian theology," and tell how he will teach it, needs plenty of elbow-room, that we are fully prepared to meet large demands on our space. This is one of the cases where brevity means obscurity. Taking his answers in their order we will observe:

1. Yes; but what would be the effect on a young man of religious teaching communicated by a professor of this kind? Would it make him religious, or deepen his faith in "God and immortality"? Moreover, what is "a theology which is not confined to the limits of any sect"? Is not this definition the substitution of one uncomprehended for another?

2. Of course every sect holds some view that some others hold; every sect believes in the existence of God; but if you teach "non-sectarian theology" you must teach only the things which no sect rejects, for whatever any considerable sect rejects and some other considerable sect holds is sectarian, and, therefore, non-teachable. Your only escape from this difficulty lies in throwing down the dogmas before the student and bidding him choose for himself. We grant that some subjects may be taught in this way, but surely theology is not one of them. The value of a theological opinion rests on the strength of conviction with which it is held. Loosely held, or merely selected from "a desirable assortment" on the recommendation of an obliging professor, it can hardly be considered a very useful part of a young man's equipment for any calling.

3. The declarations of the founders of the Divinity School are of little moment; the important thing is the practical working of it. That cases have occurred in which orthodox students have graduated in it may be true, but the fact remains that all but an infinitesimally small number of those who graduate from it are Unitarian ministers. The mode of acquiring their theology, as described in the *Christian Register*, is one which must of necessity produce theologians with little or no theology, if we may use the expression; or rather theologians whose attitude towards all doctrines is one of negation or indifference. We know of no reason why a university should not teach Hebrew and New-Testament Greek as well as Anglo-Saxon or Sanskrit, and anything else which prepares a man to study theology. Why, for instance, ecclesiastical history, which deals with

the agency which has most powerfully influenced the course of events in the modern world, is relegated to divinity schools, is something we have never understood. But our "non-sectarian" friends must not, as the *Christian Register* has done, by putting forward these subjects, to which divinity schools have no proper claim, as examples of things which may be taught undenominationaly, try to cover up their retreat about great Christian dogmas like the Atonement and the Fall of Man.

4. No one who values positive religious opinions, or thinks belief in the doctrines of Christianity of deep moment, is at all likely to endow orthodox chairs in Harvard Divinity School as described by Dr. Clarke, when he has Yale and Princeton and Andover to go to. Few religious men like to see theological teaching converted into an exercise for sharpening the wits, or would like to see young men exposed to the influence of professors who took half a dozen different views of the Trinity and the Atonement.

5. If "the Divinity School be wholly apart from the academical department," how is it to help to arouse interest "in God and immortality" in the college at large, and why should the president make a special effort on its behalf, *quâ* president? Why not leave it wholly to the care of those who understand and value unsectarian theology? Why should the University charge itself with a piece of work which no two men would describe in the same way? Classes of two hundred are large, but there is no good reason why they should not soon reach five hundred with such an equipment as the college now has, and such a position towards the country at large as President Eliot's administration during the last ten years has created for it.—ED. NATION.]

Notes.

S. C. GRIGGS & CO., Chicago, have in press 'Summer Savory,' by Benjamin F. Taylor; 'Somebody's Ned,' a novel by a Chicago author; 'A New Method for the Study of English Literature,' by Louise Maertz; and 'Clinical Lectures,' from the French of P. Jousset.—G. P. Putnam's Sons will shortly issue a rejoinder to Mr. Mallock's 'Is Life Worth Living?' "from the pen of a well-known writer."—R. Worthington will reprint for this market Sir George Campbell's 'White and Black' recently brought out by Chatto & Windus, London.—According to George P. Rowell & Co.'s *American Newspaper Directory* for July there has been an increase in the number of newspapers in the United States during the half-year from 8,703 to 9,153. Suspensions have been fewer than for several years during the corresponding period.—We are informed that Miss Emily F. Wheeler, formerly of the Northwestern University, who has just returned from a two years' residence in Europe, has been elected to the chair of French and Belles-Lettres in the Cincinnati Wesleyan College.—'Summer Vacations at Moosehead Lake and Vicinity' is published by A. Williams & Co., of Boston, for the author, Lucius L. Hubbard, who manages, in 145 pages, indexed and prettily illustrated with photographic views, to provide tourists of the usual summer variety, and also more advanced enthusiasts, with a practical and well-edited guide-book.—We learn from the *Athenæum* that a new English version of 'Don Quixote' is about to be brought out by C. Kegan Paul & Co.; also that the following English works are in preparation: Dr. Krause's 'Life of Dr. Erasmus Darwin,' translated with a preliminary notice by his grandson, Mr. Charles Darwin; a 'Memoir of Edward and Catherine Stanley,' by their son, the Dean of Westminster; 'Rheinsberg; or, the Student Life of Frederic the Great,' by Andrew Hamilton; 'Nile Gleanings,' by H. Villiers-Stuart; and 'Japanese Letters,' by Miss Bird, who rode 700 miles on horseback through the remoter regions of Japan.—Sime's 'Lessing,' reprinted in its original English by Brockhaus, at Leipzig, comes to us in two neat volumes from L. W. Schmidt, 24 Barclay Street. The form not less than the contents well fits them for the pocket or the satchel of the vacation tourist. They might be surreptitiously read even at Manhattan Beach.—Authorized German versions of selections from the Morley series of 'English Men of Letters' are announced by Eduard Wartig's establishment, in Leipzig. Goldsmith, Defoe, and Thackeray will be first published. They should prove excellent aids to students in the practice of German composition.—Von Holtzendorff's 'Handbuch des deutschen Strafs-

prozessrechts' completes with Part 6 its first volume, and enters upon the second with Parts 1 and 2 (Berlin: Carl Habel).—A portrait of Mozart, after one drawn from life in 1787 by Doris Stock, has just been published by Franz Hanfstängl, in Munich. The features are more delicate than in the common pictures and busts of the great composer. The artist was an aunt of the poet Körner.—Mr. E. Maunde Thompson contributes to the *Academy* of July 19 a number of letters which form part of the correspondence between Lady Byron and Mrs. Leigh lately purchased for the British Museum. They form another and convincing chapter of the negative evidence brought forward since the publication of Mrs. Stowe's story, now happily forgotten.—The *Portfolio* for July (Mr. Bouton) contains, besides some not over-brilliant landscape etchings, a valuable fac-simile by the Armand Durand process of a horse by Paulus Potter, well exhibiting the large, candid style of the young etcher, who may be said to have exhausted the essentials of the art in the practice of the eighteen coppers he left. Munkácsy's painting is described, representing Milton and his daughters, a fine work soon to be added to the public collection of the Lenox Library in this city. A running notice of Stanfield is begun, replacing Mr. Hamerton's criticism on Goya, an unfortunate bit of journeywork which its writer should never have undertaken. It was written without sympathy, in confessed ignorance, and might be described as a version of Yriarte's "Life," with the mild English word "shocking!" placed in various faint inflections between the lines; and Goya is not an artist who should be "written up" merely to gratify a sense of outrage.

—Mr. Lalor's translation of the second volume of Von Holst's 'Verfassung und Demokratie,' reviewed by us some weeks ago (see the *Nation*, No. 715), has just been published in a handsome volume by Callaghan & Co. (Chicago). It does not appear as a second volume, but as an independent work—'The Constitutional and Political History of the United States, etc.: 1828-1846, Jackson's Administration—Annexation of Texas'; a chapter, as it were, of our national history published by itself. The translation is in general very accurate. No doubt there are here and there Germanisms and mistranslations; it would be strange if there were not. Whatever such defects may be found come from Mr. Lalor's over-anxiety to adhere to the very words and order of the original, lest by recasting or amplifying an expression he should do injustice to the original. We think he might safely have allowed himself somewhat greater freedom. For example (p. 105), "a politically viable people" (*lebensfähig*); some such paraphrase as "a people capable of political life" would have been better and more idiomatic. So "a constitutional source" (p. 273). Of errors of translation we find two on page 202. "Für denselben" (of a vote) is rendered "on the question," instead of "for the proposition." And below: "Benton's declaration that the good services of the State banks *should have been secured*," etc. (*man . . . habe gewinnen müssen*, where the translation would, we think, require *hätte*). What Benton said ('Debates,' xiii. 403) was: "The administration *could not* cut loose from the local banks then; they were allies against the Bank of the United States, and as such *had to be saved*." (The italics are ours.) We wish Mr. Lalor had provided the book with what it needs so sadly—an index, or, at least, a practicable table of contents.

—We have received a number of additional communications, from both sides in the late war, on the subject of army breastplates, but it is quite useless to print any more. Our attention has been directed to specimen No. 4,654, in the Army Medical Museum at Washington, classified as XXVII. B. L., and described in the catalogue as "An iron breastplate . . . taken from the body of a rebel officer killed at Gettysburg, 3d July, 1863." Only one correspondent, a Confederate officer, confirms General Taylor's allegation about the strapping of Federal cavalymen to their saddles, but his testimony is not conclusive, for he only says: "I never saw an instance of it, but I have heard the statement made so circumstantially and by persons of such character that I could not doubt its truth," and adds that this was in the early period of the war. More to the point is the surmise of a Federal officer, who writes us as follows:

"The story of cavalry strapped to their horses is too absurd for belief, and cannot be worthy of serious denial. General Taylor must, however, have had something beyond sheer fiction in his mind when he wrote the paragraph. Is it not possible that some of the troopers had adopted the fashion, not uncommon later, and derived, I believe, from the Mexicans, of strapping the scabbard to the saddle, thus occasioning the delay of unbuckling when called to surrender their arms? This is a mere suggestion. But strapped scabbards are not unusual, and they may be the foundation in memory of the myth which has become curiously magnified and distorted in passing through General Taylor's brain."

—The report to Governor Hartranft of Mr. Joseph D. Weeks, Special Commissioner of the State of Pennsylvania, upon the practical operation of arbitration in settling difficulties between employers and employed in England is recently published. Mr. Weeks appears to have made a thorough study of his problem, and a careful examination of what statistics he could get during his English visit. His report gives in brief space the history and practical workings of industrial arbitration in England, describing the different systems, such as those of Nottingham and Wolverhampton, and their success or failure, with impartiality; and its conclusion is strongly in favor of the principle discussed. That it is "infinitely to be preferred" to the method of strikes is scarcely, Mr. Weeks thinks, "a subject of argument." The one method he calls that of reason, the other that of brute force. Still, he acknowledges that arbitration is not a "wonder-worker," that it is "used by men that are extremely selfish," and that "for these reasons it will fail to accomplish all that is expected." Indeed, Mr. Weeks's deductions are more comprehensive than specific and distinct, perhaps, but this does not touch the value of the record of facts from which he makes them. The historical part of his report it would be a good thing for every trades-union inwardly to digest.

—Richard Wagner contributes to the August number of the *North American Review* an article entitled "The Work and Mission of My Life." Whoever reads it with the idea of learning something on this interesting subject will certainly be disappointed. The composer of the "Meistersinger" and of the "Nibelungen" might well have saved himself the trouble of telling the world what he intended by his music, what want he felt himself called upon to supply. Those who wish to know something about his "work and mission" will find all that can be known in a careful study of his operas, beginning with "Rienzi," the work of his immature youth, following him through his transition period, in "Tannhäuser," and finally arriving at the glorious perfection of the "Meistersinger" and the "Ring of the Nibelungen"; and any one who cannot recognize the creative genius in these noble monuments will certainly be more bewildered and confused than before by the string of stilted, pompous, and pedantic phrases that compose the article in the *North American Review*. Wagner has imposed his views of his own work upon the Germans in nine stout octavo volumes. It seemed almost an impertinence towards a highly cultivated public to tell them that they must understand his works in his own way, that otherwise they don't understand them at all, and are not worthy to listen to them. A work of art, whether a poem or an opera, a painting or a marble group, cannot be called perfect if it cannot be understood, on its own merits, by an intelligent and cultivated man, without the author's own explanation of what ideas and principles of art he intends to convey. Shakspeare did not feel called upon to explain to his countrymen that there was an actual inward necessity for writing his "Hamlet," his "Lear," his "Coriolanus"; Beethoven confided to nobody what he meant by his Ninth Symphony; and Goethe left it for contemporary and later critics to sound the depths of his "Faust." An advanced state of musical culture and knowledge is necessary to understand and appreciate the "Meistersinger" and the "Nibelungen." This only proves the grandeur of the genius who wrote them, but does not call for the composer's intrusive interference. Wagner cannot resist the opportunity afforded by this article to have a fresh fling at the hated Jew. In speaking of Mendelssohn and Meyerbeer his aversion to the whole race is expressed in a sneer which may be called mild in comparison with the tone of his scandalous pamphlet, "Das Judenthum in der Musik," which appeared about ten years ago. In Robert Schumann, too, Wagner can see nothing but "a tasteful composer of little spirited and pleasant songs and pieces for the piano-forte"; yet Schumann's symphonies and other orchestral works, his chamber-music, and his pianoforte compositions approach nearer than any other composer's to the great creations which Beethoven left to the world. The style of Wagner's prose is heavy, dull, and ambiguous, unless we are here dealing with an incompetent translation, as may be suspected. The incredible self-conceit of the man is transparent in every line.

—A little more than a year ago a professorship of Anglo-Saxon was established at the University of Cambridge. There was already one at Oxford, but, singularly enough, only one man in all England to whom achievements in Anglo-Saxon philology gave a claim to either chair. This was Mr. Henry Sweet, an Oxford man, but not an Oxford professor. The new place at Cambridge, "the Elrington and Bosworth professorship of Anglo-Saxon," was filled by the appointment of the Rev. W. W. Skeat. Mr. Skeat's labors in fourteenth-century English are well known,

but his mark is yet to be made in the older language. The nomination was still the best that Cambridge could make from its own body. Mr. Skeat is a man of great activity, and not far advanced in years, and there is hope that he may do something to set forward (were it not for Sweet, the word would have to be *set up*) the scientific study of the primitive form of the mother-tongue within its original domain. The first work undertaken by the new Cambridge professor is an "Etymological Dictionary of the English Language" (Macmillan). The first quarter was issued within a year of his appointment, and the second is promised for November next, so that the book will be completed within about three years, if driven through with uniform speed. Now, there is no doubt that an etymological dictionary of our language is needed. The etymologies in Worcester, for instance, were compiled by a person or persons who had no qualification for the business. Those in the revised Webster were the work of a competent scholar, but they were abridged very materially at the instance of the publishers, who insisted that either the etymologies should be made shorter or every other one left out! Wedgwood does not stick firmly to historical ground, pursues phantoms of onomatopœia, is loose and arbitrary. A good etymological dictionary of English in English was a thing to desire. But it is not desirable that for this the Anglo-Saxon professor should be kept from his proper work even for three years. A translation of the new edition of Eduard Müller's dictionary would have answered nearly the same purposes, and might have been done by somebody else. Though Mr. Skeat may have accumulated interesting and valuable etymological notes (and a mere turning of the leaves shows a great deal of the sort), nevertheless, considering the shortness of life and the extent of the work in Anglo-Saxon which is to be done in England, and which cannot be done out of England, he should not have been drawn into making a dictionary for the sake of publishing them. Even what he describes as an important feature of the work, and perhaps regards as the most important—the attempt to mark approximately the date at which a word first appears in the language—is the very thing which cannot be done to any satisfaction within the time which Mr. Skeat has allowed himself; and this, moreover, is probably to be one of the principal objects, and the characteristic feature, of another work which the Clarendon Press announces, a dictionary of the English language founded on the materials collected by the Philological Society. But when we come to the work itself, all that is done seems to be well done. There is a good method, and the sources of information have been judiciously used. There is also much that is new, and entertaining too, in the notes on the history of words. Why certain words are left out is not clear—for example, *barbecue*, *bosh*, to *calk* (a horse), *cricket* (a footstool), *demi-john*. All these are in other etymological dictionaries, and this does not purport to be a selection. It is very much to be regretted that even courtesy to the ex-professor of Anglo-Saxon at Oxford should have allowed Mr. Skeat to speak of Earle's insane derivation of *bédridden* from "*bedrian*, to bewitch," as a "suggestion that can hardly be accepted"—a derivation which throws the root-accent back on the inseparable and necessarily unaccentable particle *be-*! This was a lapse on Mr. Earle's part which generosity should make us forget. If Mr. Skeat could fall into such a pit—but he could not—it would harrow us with fear and wonder.

—The Société de Géographie has just paid a remarkable tribute to the memory of the English navigator, Capt. James Cook. The séance held on February 14 was entirely devoted to celebrating the centennial anniversary of Cook's death. On this occasion there was exhibited a large collection of relics of Cook, and objects illustrating his voyages. The Bulletin of the Society for May gives the addresses made on this occasion by the president, Admiral de-la-Roncière-le-Noury, and MM. Huber, Hamy, and Varigny. Following this is a catalogue of the Exposition "à l'occasion du centenaire de la mort de Cook." The remainder of the Bulletin, some sixty pages, is occupied with a "Cartographie et bibliographie relatives à Cook," by James Jackson. Included in this bibliography are notices of ten charts and four hundred and seventeen separate publications of Cook's, or relating to him. The first on the list is "An Observation of an Eclipse of the Sun at the Island of New found land, August 5, 1766, by Mr. James Cook," published in the Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society in 1767. The last is "Viajes y descubrimientos en el Polo Norte por E. Contreras de Diego, Madrid, 1879." Many of the titles have notes explanatory of their reference to the great navigator.

—Krones's "Geschichte Oesterreichs" has just been brought to a completion by the publication of its fourth volume. It was originally an-

nounced to be finished in three volumes; but it would have been contrary to the nature of serial historical publications if this promise had been kept. Even the limits of four volumes are only realized by crowding the events of the eighty years from 1792 to 1870 into about a hundred pages. As an accurate and exhaustive treatise the work deserves all recognition, but it is exasperating even beyond the measure of German books in having absolutely no table of contents except for the individual books—an *Inhaltsübersicht* of half a page, for instance, for a "book" of nearly three hundred pages. When one wishes to look up some special point, and has found his place in this labyrinth, he will always find the subject treated fully and perspicuously, and in the light of the most recent scholarship. If we compare this history of Austria with that of the author's townsman, Dr. Mayer—Krones is professor in the University of Grätz, and Mayer in the *Realschule* of the same place—we should say in general that Krones's is designed for scholars, Mayer's for general readers. Mayer's two volumes are just about equal to one of Krones's; and, without being deficient in scholarship, his work makes no attempt to discuss minute and controverted points of history. It covers the ground much more proportionately, too, coming down fairly to the year 1873, and giving nearly one hundred and fifty pages to that latest period which its more voluminous rival crowds into about one hundred. Both books are well provided with genealogical tables and references to literature; neither of them, however, makes a practice of referring to authorities upon special points.

MACVEY NAPIER'S CORRESPONDENCE.*

IF some highly intellectual cook, some Ude or Vatel, had left behind him all the culinary correspondence that preceded his grand entertainments—had printed his appeals for salmon, his entreaties for *entremets*, his letters on lettuces, and had added the responses from all lands and climes—his work would have had an interest curiously like that of the delightful collection of letters here printed. After all, the process of victualing a castle or a palace is not very unlike that of keeping a review supplied with the needed nutriment. Through all Mr. Napier's most familiar letters the reader finds him always the same persistent literary purveyor, whose one great object is to secure with unfailing regularity the fit rations for the *Edinburgh*.

He was born April 11, 1776, and was educated at the universities of Edinburgh and Glasgow. In 1799 he became a member of the "Society of Writers to the Signet," and in 1805 was made librarian of that fraternity of lawyers. In 1814 he was appointed editor of the "Supplement to the Encyclopædia Britannica"; in 1824 was made first professor of conveyancing in the University of Edinburgh; and in 1829 was selected by Lord Jeffrey as his successor in the editorship of the *Edinburgh Review*. This office—then the most influential position in British literature—he retained until his death, which occurred February 11, 1847. For more than thirty years, in these successive editorships, he was in confidential correspondence with the leading literary men of his nation, and selections from his letters and theirs make up this volume of more than five hundred pages. The persons who appear the most frequently are Jeffrey, Brougham, Macaulay, McCulloch, and Sir James Stephen. There are also letters, though less abundant, from Scott, Hazlitt, Moore, Godwin, Gifford, Carlyle, the two Mills, Bulwer, Campbell, Wilson, Senior, Dickens, Thackeray, Buller, Palmerston, Lord John Russell, Lewes, and Mrs. Austin. Mingled with these letters are many from contributors whose support was most important to the *Review*, in those days, but whose very names are almost forgotten. How many Americans could lay their hands on their hearts and assert that they ever heard of John Allen or William Empson?

In dealing with all these it was the editor's duty to plan, propose, oppose, criticise, encourage, refuse, mediate; to soothe jealousies and reconcile feuds; to deal with a class proverbially irritable, and yet avoid irritation; to win new contributors, and yet keep old ones; to maintain *esprit de corps*, and yet have his own way. In all this he certainly had a great success. When we consider that Lord Brougham had maintained such a right of ownership in the *Edinburgh Review* that Jeffrey had been accustomed to beg new contributors not to mention that they wrote for it lest they should offend this touchy monopolist (p. 3); when we find McCulloch getting into a rage (p. 76) because the editor admits a single paper on political economy from anybody but himself,—we must recognize the rare qualities needed to keep house for so very unreasonable a family.

It is hard to tell whether one is more amused in this book with what the writers say of one another or with what they think of themselves. Tom Moore frankly avows that if he has a strong point it is theology, and he delights to announce that he is habitually termed in Ireland "Defender of the Faith and Father of the Hibernian Church" (pp. 115, 137). Macaulay, usually very good-natured in his tone, describes Wilson as a "grog-drinking, cock-fighting, cudgel-playing Professor of Moral Philosophy"; and Senior thinks the same Christopher North "one of the very worst of the clever bad writers who infest our literature; full of bombast, affectation, conceit—in short, of all the *vitia tristia* as well as *dulcia*"; and closes with saying, "I had almost as soon try to read Carlyle or Coleridge" (p. 424).

It is singular to find in a man of Carlyle's superiority so much less recognition of his own weak points than in Macaulay. Carlyle's strongest conviction is that "at all events one can and should ever *speak quietly*; loud, hysterical vehemence, foaming and hissing, least of all becoms him that is convinced, and not only *supposes*, but *knows*" (p. 97). Yet it never seems to occur to him that he here condemns himself, whereas Macaulay constantly recognizes by his own self-criticism the precise faults that posterity discovers in his essays. He thinks his paper on Burleigh "a strange rambling performance" that ought to be put into the fire (p. 127); says that he has "never written a page of criticism on poetry or the fine arts" which he would not "burn if he had the power" (p. 257); that his "Frederic the Great" does not go deep (p. 381), and that the editor and the public will probably think "Addison" a failure (p. 429); that he "will not found any pretensions to be a classic" on his review articles (p. 394); that he is far from putting himself on a level with Mackintosh or Dugald Stewart (p. 410); that his essay on Moore's "Byron" is "wretchedly bad" (p. 112), and that some of his articles are "viciously florid" (p. 77) and passages in others "indecorously violent" (p. 66). There are few among his published essays which he reads with satisfaction, but happily those few are the latest (p. 428). Certainly the whole impression of Macaulay in these letters is most agreeable, and he shows the greatest good-nature that is possible for an author when he more than once authorizes Napier to erase from his essays anything that might seem too personal, adding: "I had much rather that in a case of private provocation you should judge for me than that I should judge for myself" (p. 100).

It surprises one to find how frankly Macaulay was discussed by his contemporaries, and how many of the later opinions of critics were anticipated while the essays were yet fresh. Sir James Stephen, to be sure, says: "I can forgive him anything, and am violently tempted to admire even his faults" (p. 391); but see the vehemence of Lord Cockburn's utterance in 1844: "Though I incur your contempt by the sentiment, I think the brilliancy of his style, especially on historical subjects, the worst thing about him. Delighting, as I always do, in his thoughts, views, and knowledge, I feel too often compelled to curse and roar at his words, and the structure of his composition. As a corrupter of style he is more dangerous to the young than Gibbon. His seductive powers greater, his defects worse. But still I rejoice in all his deliveries" (p. 474). On the other hand, Carlyle writes in 1832: "Macaulay is always spirited and emphatic, worth reading even on a worn-out matter" (p. 129); while Macaulay says in the same year: "As to Carlyle, he might as well write in Irving's unknown tongue at once" (p. 122).

Lord Brougham, writhing under personal unpopularity, succeeds in convincing himself that Macaulay is more unpopular still, calls him pityingly "Poor Tom," and says that "he is absolutely renowned in society as the greatest bore that ever yet appeared." "I have seen people," he continues, "come in from Holland House breathless and knocked up, and able to say nothing but 'Oh! dear, oh! mercy.' What's the matter? being asked, 'Oh! Macaulay.' Then every one says: 'That accounts for it; you're lucky to be alive,' etc. (p. 403). He declares in the same letter that Macaulay "is always upon stilts, never able to say the plainest thing in a plain way. . . . half poetry, half novel, no argument, no narrative—fifty little periods in a paragraph, fifty little sparkling points in a sentence." And, after all, the article thus sharply condemned turned out not to be Macaulay's, but Stephen's, and all the wrath had to be retracted in the very next letter! On the other hand, Macaulay more composedly sets down Brougham as "all but mad," and says that "the stories which wander about town as to his sayings and doings are almost incredible, yet the strangest of them are true" (p. 429).

The correspondence most essential to the value of the book—that indeed which, in spite of fragmentary material, gives to the whole a continuous interest—is the series of letters to and from Jeffrey. To him

* Selections from the Correspondence of the late MacVey Napier, Esq. Edited by his Son, MacVey Napier. London and New York: Macmillan & Co. 1879.

alone, as predecessor and confidential adviser, could Napier write with entire freedom, and the answering letters supply a continuous commentary on all that occurs. Jeffrey is informally that functionary often wished for in literature—a reviewer of reviews—for he furnishes a careful criticism on each issue as it appears; and he is always ready to be called on for counsel, when it is necessary to mediate between Watt and Brewster, to repress Brougham or to curtail Macaulay. His prophecies as to particular contributors may not always have found fulfilment in history, as where he has hopes of Carlyle's one day becoming an "elegant" writer; but he has admirable sense, and his criticisms on the whole hit the mark better than those of anybody else. At any rate his letters constantly supply gaps left by those of others, or give the same facts at a wholly different angle. Indeed, this series of utterances from different persons often seems like the various versions of the same story in Browning's "The Ring and the Book," or like the children's play of "Consequences"—what he said, what she said, and what the world said. In these pages we hear first from some contributor, punctual and unconscious, simply doing what has been asked; then from another contributor, very indignant; then from the sagacious adviser, suggesting the discreet course; then from the editor, bland, conciliatory, final. *Tantome celebrates ipse?* asks the innocent reader, when put behind the scenes of this battle of the gods. Thus, Sir David Brewster is set to review Whewell's "Philosophy of Inductive Sciences," having previously reviewed another book by the same author, and having frankly expressed to Napier the opinion that Whewell was "a mere bookmaker" who displayed the most deplorable ignorance (p. 193). Naturally, the criticism when it finally appears (January, 1872) proves anything but flattering, and as it occupies the first place in the number, it attracts much attention. Jeffrey at once complains of it as "a great deal too personal and bitter" (p. 371); Macaulay thinks it prompted by "every sort of animosity, personal animosity, national animosity, academical animosity" (p. 377). These frank criticisms are duly transmitted to the unlucky reviewer, who declares that he wrote "without soreness or irritation," that Lord Brougham and Sir John Barrow endorse his review, and that it was written with the knowledge that Arago and Biot would read it. Then Macaulay writes, partly retracting and admitting that Brewster's view may be the true one after all. But how little did the innocent readers of the *Edinburgh*, accepting all its verdicts as the solemn award of some unseen court of infallibles, know how the dread tribunal was divided against itself, and what hard names the judges were calling one another through the post-office!

Literary history as yet records but few authors who positively enjoyed being cut to pieces in a leading quarterly; and the editor is pretty sure to be like that British drummer who complained of the unreasonableness manifested by the soldiers whom he had to flog, inasmuch as whether he hit high or low there was no such thing as pleasing them. Mr. Napier's tact seldom fails, however, and seems to have fairly deserted him only once, when he wrote to Leigh Hunt that he should like to have "a gentlemanlike article from him." "Between ourselves," remonstrates the kindly Macaulay, "the word *gentlemanlike* was used in rather a harsh way; and considering that poor Hunt has more than once been attacked for really ungentlemanlike conduct, and is naturally sore on that point, I am not much surprised that he was hurt" (p. 366). It took a long letter from Macaulay to make the necessary explanations; then Napier wrote "a most generous and amiable letter," by which the wounded poet was much touched and "more than satisfied." Whether Macaulay was the gainer by his intervention may be doubted, for it appears that just a year after, on the publication of his "Roman Ballads," Leigh Hunt wrote to him to lament that these ballads were no better, and to ask for a small pecuniary loan. Macaulay says that he should have refused the loan had it been accompanied by praises, but that he gladly sent Hunt a few guineas for his frankness (p. 411). If plain-speaking among authors brings in the market a reward thus high, this volume may well have an ample retail-price set upon it, for it is rare to find between two covers so many instances of that particular virtue.

THE MEANING OF LIFE.*

THE question of the value of life, according to Mr. Mallock, conveys to different minds such different meanings that he finds it necessary at the outset to define in precise terms the exact nature of the question as he undertakes to answer it. When he asks, "Is life worth living?" he is not enquiring "whether its balance of pains is necessarily

and always in excess of its balance of pleasures," nor "whether any one has been, or whether any one is, happy," but *whether life ought to be found worth living by all?* For this, he says, is what it is pronounced to be when as a general truth it is said to be "worth living"; when it is said to be sacred, or solemn, or earnest, or significant. The meaning of all such language is that those who hold it believe life to have some deep, inherent worth of its own "beyond what it can acquire or lose by the caprice of circumstance," health, or riches, or success—an essential value which it can lose by no act but our own. This superior value, of course, life has derived from religion. It is belief in the existence of God, as a rewarder of good and punisher of evil, and in the continuation of existence after death, which gives life on earth its overwhelming importance and meaning. Whatever substitutes for these beliefs may be suggested or invented for the future, it is not open to dispute that in the past the sacredness of life has rested, as the very word implies, upon a purely religious basis. Now, the progress of science has, in the opinion of persons whom Mr. Mallock somewhat vaguely calls "Positivists" (by this word he declares in the prefatory note that he does not refer to the Comtists, but to "the whole scientific school"), eliminated the supernatural from life, and the question therefore arises, Whether from what is left we can extract any value for life at all? The Positive thinkers (such men as Huxley and Tyndall, for instance) "have taken everything away from life that to wise men hitherto has seemed to redeem it from vanity," and they now have to prove to us that they have not left it vain. For the positivists are entirely unwilling to face the dilemma in which science has placed them, and throw religion overboard altogether. They wish to retain the moral advantages of the supernatural without subjecting themselves to its intellectual fetters, and it is therefore incumbent upon them to explain how, if they remove the intellectual support on which the intrinsic value of life has always been rested, they can still maintain that value to have a real existence. Mr. Mallock quotes "the most popular English exponent of the new school"—probably Mr. Frederic Harrison—as admitting "to the full all that has ever been said about the dignity of man's moral and spiritual life," and points out that this dignity must, if positivism be true, be found "in the very place where hitherto it has been thought to be conspicuous by its absence"—"in this earthly life, this life between the cradle and the grave." Where, therefore, do they find it? We have not space to go through in detail the various answers which Mr. Mallock suggests as possible for positivists to make. They all agree that the dignity of life, whatever else it may be, is essentially moral in character. Life, that is, contains some special prize to which morality is the only road. But the prize must, if it has any existence, be describable, and its value verifiable by positive methods. But such positivists as J. S. Mill, George Eliot, and Professor Huxley have never been able to describe the prize or verify its value. The nearest approach they have made to it is to imagine the advancement of the general happiness of the race to be the goal which makes life worth living. Impassioned benevolence is to be the motive power of all the positivist's ethical machinery, and the spring of this is to be a belief that such benevolence will tend, in the long run, to make this human life of ours something better and higher and purer. But this is to the last degree vague, and can hardly be said to give life a meaning or importance to any but a very few highly educated and refined persons.

The positivists, then, do not succeed in giving to life, after they have taken from it its religious meaning, any new value. It remains nothing more nor less than human life, without any religious basis, and without any other moral basis than will be furnished by the common sense and prudence of mankind. There are, of course, many moral rules which would be enforced by public opinion, religion or no religion; but in the absence of religion they would rest on nothing higher than utility. We are threatened, therefore, with a terrible future, the like of which has never before been thought of—the disappearance of religion from the earth; and not only of religion, but of all the thousand hopes and aspirations inspired by religion, and there remains nothing but dull empty life. We must refer the reader to the book itself for the very striking and disagreeable picture which Mr. Mallock draws of the world as it is to be, after the positivists have had full swing for a certain time.

If Mr. Mallock had closed his book here it would have been a most effective exposure of the pretensions of positivism to furnish any guide for the conduct of life, or any substitute for religion; and this we think would have been a practical benefit to the world at large, and to the positivists in particular, for whatever claims to public respect they have established have been the claims of a school devoted to exact thought and to truth. A positivist (we use the term in the sense in which Mr. Mallock

* "Is Life worth Living? By William Hurrell Mallock." New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1879.

uses it) is bound by the laws of his philosophy to admit nothing to have a real existence except the phenomena of the natural world. That there may be realities outside of this he neither affirms nor denies, but his refusal to do either is equivalent for practical purposes to a denial. The position of the positivist is, therefore, of all those which the enemies of religion have taken from the beginning of the world the hardest to attack. He does not dispute the existence of God or of a future life, nor does he even question the possibility of a revelation. He merely says that we have no knowledge of anything as yet except the unalterable course of nature, which tells us nothing of God, or of a future life, or of revelation. It is difficult to see how this purely agnostic position can be attacked in any way. It is admitted on all hands that the degree of proof which can be produced in support of any of the tenets of a natural theism is not greater than a high degree of probability, and all that positivists say on the subject is that a high degree of probability is not proof in the sense in which we apply the term in ordinary life, and that while they have no sort of objection to any one worshipping a probable God, or indulging in hopes of a possible future life, they themselves do not feel called upon to join in the devotion or share the hope. But, as Mr. Mallock shows, unfortunately for their reputation for consistency, they have not been content with leaving the mystery of life unexplained. Feeling, as every one, philosopher or not, feels in his heart, that life contemplated as a riddle, of which the key is fatally lost, is not a spectacle calculated to produce content or happiness; feeling the necessity of something outside of life as a standard by which life may be tested, of a lamp by which it may be lighted, of a consolation by which it may be supported, they have endeavored to find within the limits of their philosophy something corresponding to religion, and they have failed. On their own showing, religion belongs to a world with which they have nothing to do; and for them after all to put on priestly robes and volunteer the invention of a new superstition, is an impertinence which we instinctively resent. We have no space to examine in detail the arguments by which Mr. Mallock shows "the utter hollowness of that vague faith in progress, and the glorious prospects that lie before humanity, on which the Positive school at present so much rely, and about which so much is said." His seventh chapter, on "The Superstition of Positivism," is a masterly criticism of those vague emotional substitutes for the Positive tenets of Christianity with which every one is familiar in the writings of Tyndall, George Eliot, and other positive thinkers. As an exposure of the fallacies of this school the whole volume cannot be too highly commended. But Mr. Mallock has proposed to himself an undertaking vastly greater than an exposure of the fallacies of positivism. His book is not only an attack on positivism; it is an appeal in favor of Holy Church. Although we believe the author still professes an attitude of scepticism, his book is, as distinctly as it is possible for a book to be, a Catholic tract, and the last half of it is devoted to a clever résumé of arguments by which he thinks the Catholic faith is supported. Most of this is such familiar ground that we shall not tax our readers' patience by going over it in detail. First, we have arguments for the existence of a God; and, theism once established, the probabilities of a revelation are raised to a very high point. But a revelation once granted, it is quite clear that it is not to be found in the Bible, but in the Church, an inspired body which has had a continuous existence since the revelation of the true religion. All this part of the book forms one of the best Catholic tracts that we have ever seen, and Leo XIII. is much to be congratulated upon being able to number among English sceptics one whose method of reasoning is so little affected by his scepticism. But it does not to our minds strengthen the book, the merit of which lies in its attack on positivism. As to this, however, in the interest of fair argument we desire to offer one or two observations. We have already said that, considered as an exposure of Positive superstition, it is very strong. As an attack on Positive morality, however, it goes too far.

Mr. Mallock's argument is in the nature of a *reductio ad absurdum*. The positivist takes away the religious basis of life, and what does he offer instead? Everything that he proposes is in turn shown by Mr. Mallock to be out of the question; and, therefore, he leaves it to be inferred that there must be some religious basis for life, and thus there can be nothing in positivism. It does not appear, however, to have occurred to Mr. Mallock that the sentiment of *altruism*, and the duty of sacrificing one's self for one's neighbor, is simply one branch of the Christian law of life, the other having been left out from the Positive creed because its affirmation presupposes a confession of theistic faith. What is Professor Clifford's "band-work" but an awkward expression of the idea that it is a duty to love one's neighbor as one's self? But if the consequences of altru-

ism are absurd when altruism is put forward as a guide for life by a positivist, they must be equally absurd when put forward by a Christian. *Ergo*, Christian morality is absurd. And is it not so? Does not the following description by Mr. Mallock of the positivist's ideal world apply with quite as great satirical force to that held in view by Christians?

"They live in a world of their own imagining, in which all the rules of this world are turned upside down. There the defeated candidate in an election would be radiant at his rival's victory. When a will was read the anxiety of each relative would be that he or she should be excluded in favor of the others; or, more probably still, that they should be all excluded in favor of a hospital. Two rivals in love with the same woman would be each anxious that his own suit might be thwarted."

To every man of the world—and it is to men of the world to which these arguments are addressed—it is quite clear that unselfishness as a guide to the conduct of life involves an inversion of most of the ordinary rules of conduct. We cannot see that a divine sanction alters this fact. Whether it is God or Professor Huxley who tells us that it is our duty to seek others' happiness rather than our own, it is equally true that it is impossible to imagine a world in which the command is acted upon to such an extent that a desire for the happiness of others has become a primary motive. But surely a rule that we never expect to see the world conform to is no practical guide for life. We think, therefore, that it may be fairly objected to Mr. Mallock's *reductio ad absurdum* of Positive morality that it is also a *reductio ad absurdum* of Christian morality. Mr. Mallock tries to get over this difficulty by the following argument:

"The positivists ask the Christians how they expect to enjoy themselves in heaven. The Christians may, with far more force, ask the positivists how they expect to enjoy themselves on earth. For the Christians' heaven being *ex hypothesi* an unknown world, they do not stultify their expectations from being unable to describe them. On the contrary, it is a part of their faith that they are indescribable. But the positivists' heaven is altogether in this world, and no mystical faith has any place in their system."

But this does not cover the ground. The Christian heaven may be indescribable, but the Christian rules of morality are not so; they are identical with those of positivism. Now, Mr. Mallock makes very merry over "altruism" in the Positive system, while in that of Christianity he sees nothing absurd. But it is unlikely that a just God would reveal a religion a part of which is a moral system that is, as Mr. Mallock shows, on its face absurd; *ergo*, the Christian religion is an imposture. Such is the conclusion to which Mr. Mallock's argument forces us. But, after all, no *reductio ad absurdum* of its moral system can prove or disprove the truth of the positivist philosophy. The only question as to this is whether it is true or not; and though Mr. Mallock makes a very effective plea against what he supposes to be the fallacy that truth is an end in itself, it is certainly not open to those who take part in the discussions of philosophy to maintain that error is an end in itself. Both the positivists and Mr. Mallock propose to themselves the same end, the investigation of the facts of life. They reach one conclusion, he another. The only possible question as to the different results must be, Which is true? This was the only question at the beginning, and it must be the only question at the end. That remote consequences deduced from the conclusion arrived at in either case seem absurd, does not disprove the truth of the conclusion.

Mr. Mallock cites for another purpose a passage from John Stuart Mill's autobiography, which may be used as an illustration of the commission by a positivist of a fault which generally disfigures arguments as to natural and revealed religion. According to Mill's account, one of the most conclusive arguments to his mind against the existence of the Christian God was the supposed existence of hell. The possibility of an all-wise and all-good creator condemning his creatures to endless torments seemed to him inconsistent with his supposed attributes. But if the existence of God can be proved by arguments which commend themselves to our reason, we cannot get rid of him by proving that he does what we could not understand an enlightened human judge doing under the circumstances. When it is said that God is all-wise, all-good, and all-powerful, we do not understand that the epithets are used in their ordinary sense, but that the attributes of the Divinity in all respects surpass and defy the understanding. Therefore, the fact of the existence of a superhuman being once proved, it is a sheer impossibility by ordinary human arguments to disprove the possibility of his having made a hell. In a somewhat similar way, if an apparently faultless chain of reasoning leads us to the conclusion that we cannot know whether a God exists or not, it is idle to ask us after that to explain what will happen to life if this agnostic condition becomes general. Mr. Mallock's book is full of arguments to show that, if reli-

gion is not true, then is the human race indeed most miserable, and that the system of positivism is an absurd one; but what he calls the agnostic major premise—i. e., "that we can be certain of nothing that we cannot support by proof"—he does not seem to us to meet. It is no reply to this to show that Tyndall shirks the question too.

History of Medicine in New Jersey, and of its Medical Men, from the Settlement of the Province to A.D. 1800. By Stephen Wickes, A.M., M.D. (Newark: Martin R. Dennis & Co. 1879.)—This work, like the title, divides itself into two parts, the latter, and by far the larger, comprehending some 300 biographical sketches of New Jersey practitioners down to the beginning of the present century. The first part is much less restricted than the title would lead one to suppose, for the author, in his history of medicine, includes all the colonies in his survey. He shows how in the beginning the practice of the healing art was chiefly in the care of the clergy, and that they were the authors of some of the earliest medical papers printed in America. In an appendix he reprints a rare pamphlet by the Rev. Jonathan Dickinson on Throat Distemper (Boston, 1740). In the most sparsely settled regions the physicking was chiefly done by women, and everywhere the midwife ruled over her special department. Dr. Wickes states that obstetrics were first taught in a medical school at the University of Edinburgh in 1726, when instruction was confined solely to midwives; and not till thirty years afterwards were classes formed for male students. "The profession of an accoucheur was esteemed very unbecoming a gentleman, and it was only in the most extreme cases that his advice or aid was sought." The first man midwife recorded in the colonies was a New York physician who died in 1745. To proclaim one's self such "was deemed a scandal to some delicate ears, and Mrs. Grany Brown, with her fees of two and three dollars, was still deemed the choice of all who thought women should be modest." The early obstetrician was not recognized as the peer of the regular physician.

Under the head of Medical Practice we read that in 1718 the method then prevailing in New England was waggishly yet not untruly described as "very uniform—bleeding, vomiting, blistering, purging, anodynes, etc. If the illness continued, there was repetendi and finally murderandi. Nature was never to be consulted or allowed to have any concern in the affair." As for systems, Sydenham's came first; in 1760 that of Boerhaave (the so-called humoral pathology) "governed the practice of every physician in Philadelphia," and doubtless elsewhere; and from 1783 to the close of the century Cullen's "Practice of Physic" was the approved text-book. A Swedish traveller, Kalm, in 1747-49 noticed that

"Europeans in North America, whether born in Sweden, England, Germany, or Holland, or in America of European parents, always lost their teeth sooner than common. This was especially true of women. The Indians, as he had observed, always had fine teeth. It did not, therefore, arise from the climate. He ascribed it to the use of tea, and to the custom of eating and drinking everything hot. The same effect was produced upon the Indian women after they had become addicted to the use of tea."

The throat distemper, identical with diphtheria, began in May, 1735, "at Kingston, an inland town in New Hampshire, situated in a low plain." Yellow fever is believed to antedate the arrival of the Pilgrims, and to have almost annihilated the coast natives of New England in 1618. As there was no intercourse then with the West Indies, this is regarded as proof of the origin of yellow fever in this country between the 41st and 44th degrees of latitude. In 1798 "it prevailed to some extent on the shores of the Delaware in New Jersey, where it seemed to find its origin."

The New Jersey Medical Society was organized July 23, 1766, and was the first provincial or State society in America. Dr. Wickes collects the scattered notices of other even earlier associations of medical men in the various colonies. One of the first acts of the New Jersey Society was to make a rule that no student should be taken as an apprentice by any of the members "unless he has a competent knowledge of Latin, and some initiation in the Greek." It strove still further to elevate the profession by procuring the enactment of a law providing for the license of physicians by judges of the Supreme Court, after an examination before a board of medical men, who were usually appointed by the Society. The lead taken by Philadelphia in the founding of medical schools caused students from New Jersey to seek instruction there during the last and for the greater part of the present century; even now, all from West Jersey and most of those from East Jersey receive their degrees in Philadelphia. The French wars of 1758-66 were of great advantage to the

medical profession, both from the opportunities for practice and from association with the more cultivated British army surgeons.

The biographical sketches in this volume are somewhat proportioned in length to the author's ability to supplement notices already published in the county medical histories, in which New Jersey is so rich. Sometimes they are reduced to a simple copy of an epitaph, but the proverbial insincerity of such records is not emulated by Dr. Wickes, who frankly tells the truth about several hard characters, forgers, drunkards, and debauchees. If space permitted we might borrow a number of amusing anecdotes with which these histories are enlivened. What is most remarkable is the heredity of the profession in many instances. Take the case of the Blachlys. Dr. Stephen L. Blachly, still living in Pennsylvania, says:

"An old friend and neighbor of mine informed me that my great-grandfather and my grandfather bled him when he was about sixteen, while they were in New Jersey. When a young man he removed to Pennsylvania and settled near my brother [qu. father? also a M.D.], and he bled him; later in life I bled him; and in advanced life, being of plethoric habit, my son also bled him; making five successive generations in the family who bled the same subject, with marked relief, and he lived to be eighty-five years old."

Besides these, Dr. Wickes chronicles the Budds, Elmers, and Piersons, four generations each; the Burnetts, Campfields, and Hornblowers, three each. We must not forget to mention the ancestor of Dr. Hezekiah Stites, John Stites, one of the original emigrants to New England, settled at Hempstead, Long Island, who is said to have "lived to the extraordinary age of one hundred and twenty-two or one hundred and twenty-three years, and when upwards of one hundred was able to walk forty miles a day." On pp. 130-31, there is a confusion between Dr. Assheton and his father (both dying at the age of thirty-seven, the latter July 9, 1773, the former January 4, 1774), which we cannot reduce to order. On page 19, "*Siriodendron tulipifera*" is printed for "*Liriodendron*," and these are almost the only errors we have detected in this laboriously compiled and elegantly-printed book, for which the thanks, not only of physicians but of the general reader, must be heartily given to Dr. Wickes.

Gazette des Beaux-Arts. Deuxième Série. Tome xix. (New York: J. W. Bouton. 1879.)—When this volume, just concluded by the June number, began, there were two subjects in hand and not yet done with—viz., the examination by M. Charles Éphrussi of Albert Dürer's drawings, scattered among the various museums and private collections of Europe, and "Diane de Poitiers and her Taste in the Fine Arts," by M. Anatole de Montaiglon. The latter series of papers is completed by a very long one in the February number. Some late explorations among the ruins of Diane's famous château of Anet had brought to light interesting constructions which had been forgotten, and statues and sculptured ornaments long since lost had been identified at the Louvre, at the Church of the Sorbonne, and in the neighborhood of the château; so that the vast and princely building, one of the wonders of the Renaissance, the central part of whose principal front is set up as a model in the court of the École des Beaux-Arts, comes up for a fresh discussion, which, with its illustrations, forms a useful appendix to the great monograph of M. Rodolphe Pfnoir. But it is not only the stately residence of the famous courtesan that is treated of: her library with its superb bindings; the utensils and fittings of her household; her personal adornments, and the allegorical and enigmatical designs, in the taste of the time, made to her honor and glory—the examination of all these goes to the elucidation of a curious epoch in the history of art. What Madame de Pompadour was to a later time and a degraded art, was "Madame la Grand-Sénéchale" to the French Renaissance.

M. Éphrussi's study of Dürer is a long one; the eighth paper is in the January number, and the ninth, in the March number, completes it. It is rather a sketch of Dürer's life than a critical or comparative study; but an immense number of his drawings are named in their chronological order, and many of them are reproduced. It is a valuable treatise, in the historical sense, and forms one more life of Dürer, and one taken from a new point of view.

One of the most voluminous treatises in this volume is M. Yriarte's "*Les Arts à la Cour des Malatesta au XVe Siècle*." It is completed in three numbers. It seems more serious and careful than the big parlor-table books which have come from the author of late years; and, although we cannot advise any reader to take M. Yriarte for a critical authority, and although he is far too much inclined to take for granted everything that a famous artist does or a famous epoch produces, yet this examination into the history and character of buildings seldom visited,

bas-reliefs almost unknown, medals dear to a few collectors but unheard of by most students, cannot but have its value. The author's historical researches seem, moreover, to have been extensive and serious. Nor does this essay complete the list of papers devoted to the French Renaissance; M. Ferdinand de Lasteyrie, of the Institute, whose death last May at the age of seventy called attention to his consistent protest against the Second Empire from the *Coup d'état* to the end, had contributed the first part of a paper on the Constable de Montmorency and his patronage of the arts, a valuable essay which we fear never to see completed.

M. François Lenormand contributes to the February and April numbers a very interesting article on the Schliemann discoveries at Mycenæ, in which he refuses to accept the enthusiastic theory or rather assumption of the discoverer of the royal tombs in the Acropolis. Some valuable illustrations, not borrowed from Dr. Schliemann's book but from photographs specially taken, add to the value of this review. Other reviews of books on art are limited to one paper each; thus, the editor-in-chief, M. Louis Gonse, notices Adeline's 'Sculptures Grotesques et Symboliques,' and Vidal's 'Les Instruments à archet'; M. Eugène Müntz, librarian of the École des Beaux-Arts, reviews the magnificent work of M. Paul Mantz on Holbein, the third large book devoted to Holbein's life and work which has been published within a few years, and the best of the three; and M. Paul Mantz writes the notice of the book on the sculptors and metal-engravers, the father and sons Cafféri, by that M. Guiffrey who is known as biographer of Charles Jacque and author of the catalogue of that great etcher's work. These book reviews are not quite what we hope to see in the new Boston art-monthly. French criticism, even the best of it, is apt to be too polite, and to carry too far the good theory that every man's work should be judged from his own standpoint and not from another; and then these book notices are, perhaps confessedly, not critical at all; they are called *comptes-rendus*, as if to disclaim any great severity in passing judgment. The volume ends, as all the volumes do, with a long list of works on the fine arts published during the semester.

One of the most useful articles is the long study of the Museums of the North of Europe, by the Count Clément-de-Ris. The three papers contained in the volume before us are devoted to the Hermitage at St. Petersburg, and one of the illustrations to this is a full-page drawing by M. Goutzwiller of that wonderful Grecian vase which made the despair of M. Vitet, the vase of Cumæ, "la perle, le lustre de la collection Campana," one of those wonderful vases, with figures in relief and gilded and painted, which Russia obtained before France bought the rest of that famous collection in 1862. These papers are very minute and exact, forming almost a catalogue of the museum, with critical enquiry into the authenticity of the ascriptions, etc., and one apparently very thorough and valuable.

But it is impossible to describe all the papers of this volume, and we wish to call attention to what seems to us one of the best features of the *Gazette des Beaux-Arts*, the frequent appearance in its columns of careful papers written by competent judges, and illustrated by good draughtsmen, on works of art which are at the time exciting general attention. Thus, the Louvre acquires, for the price of forty thousand francs, a bust of Philip Strozzi by Benedetto da Majano, and in the January number M. Gonse gives an account of its origin and former home, and the inscription which is hidden beneath, not to be seen by the visitor to the gallery where it stands; while M. Paul Laurent gives a large drawing of the bust. Another recent addition to the Louvre is the kneeling or crouching Venus, found long ago at Vienne in Dauphiny, and until now a private possession. To this statue M. Félix Ravaisson, of the Institute, devotes a long paper, accompanied by three drawings of the statue, two from as many different points of the statue as found, and the third of the statue as set up in the Louvre, with feet added, all three by M. Montalan. M. Joseph Israëls has just finished a set of etchings, it appears, and they were not yet for sale when in the April number M. Duranty gave three pages to their consideration, and one very lovely specimen ("Enfants sur la Plage," a real gem) accompanies the text. It was in this way that Méryon, and afterward Haden, were introduced to the French public. In like manner there is question of two splendid portraits by Rembrandt, which, with other paintings, had been bought a year before by the Rothschilds, in Amsterdam, to the great scandal of all Holland. Mr. Henri Havard, author of a charming book about the dead cities of the Zuyder Zee, and, more lately, of a treatise on Delft ware, a large volume with splendid illustrations, writes upon the subject of these Rembrandts and their companions in exile, and two full-page etchings by Flameng accompany the text. And in connection with these articles on

current topics it is right to name the engraving by M. Gaillard of "Monseigneur Pie," the bishop of Poitiers, with a brief mention of this and other works of that wonderful engraver, by M. Gonse. Why M. Gaillard's works are so little sought for by collectors, at least in this country, it would be hard to say, but every owner of a set of the *Gazette des Beaux-Arts* has half-a-dozen of them, the work of the only original line-engraver, so far as we know, who is now alive and at work. In nothing does the *Gazette* deserve more praise and thanks than in the care with which these engravings *tirées à part* are printed, for the etchings by Haden, Israëls, Jacque, and a score of other masters, and these burin engravings of Gaillard's, are satisfactory and brilliant prints, good enough for any collector's choice. No doubt the coppers are steeled, and the prints therefore, while uniformly good, a little less rich and mellow than a few early proofs before the *acérage*; but that is of course.

The Pedigree and History of the Washington Family: derived from Odin, the Founder of Scandinavia, B.C. 70, involving a period of eighteen centuries, and including fifty-five generations, down to General George Washington, first President of the United States. By Albert Welles, President of the American College for Genealogical Registry and Heraldry. (New York: Society Library. 1879. Pp. xl. and 370.)—In past years it has been our duty to speak pretty plainly about Mr. Welles and his sham College of American Heraldry. We were also obliged to censure his pretentious and unfounded genealogies; and we truly hoped, for the credit of American literature, that we should never again encounter his name on a title-page. But it seems that we misinterpreted his silence, and that he has really been engaged in an enterprise worse than its predecessors. Few people cared whether or not his stories about the Welles family were true; but it is a national disgrace to have a false pedigree set forth for the greatest representative of our country. George Washington has, indeed, been unfortunate in his successive heralds. Sir Isaac Heard, full of zeal and sympathy, published a wrong pedigree of the ancestors of the emigrant Washington. Then the Rev. Mr. Simpkinson tried to correct that story and substituted a fresh blunder. This one died hard. The Legislature of Massachusetts, inspired by Charles Sumner, sanctioned it, and during the present year *Harper's Magazine* gave a fresh impetus to it. But it is an avowed error, and Mr. Simpkinson has repeatedly expressed his regret at his mistake. Now, after all this, we are brought face to face with a new and infinitely greater bundle of figments, and we can only hope that Mr. Welles has been the dupe of an abler writer, who has deliberately concocted a literary forgery.

In the New York *World* for March 29, 1879, Colonel Joseph L. Chester, a genealogist and antiquary of the first rank, now living in London, sounded the alarm. Colonel Chester knows more about the Washingtons than any other man; he has for years studied the matter, and he exposed the errors of Heard and Simpkinson years ago. He had seen proof-sheets of Welles's book, and he termed it "unmitigated rubbish." For the English pedigree Welles seems to rely upon "James Phillippe," of London. This is said to be one alias of an adventurer who calls himself "Marshal-General Plantagenet Harrison," a getter-up of pedigrees to order, and unpleasantly known to literary men in England. At all events, the character of his work shows that he is without scruples or without judgment. His book abounds in direct statements for which he declines to give any authority. A pedigree thus prepared is useless, and its author must expect the harshest construction to be put on his silence. Mr. Welles, indeed, tried to reply in the New York *Herald* of May 19, 1879, to the crushing criticism of Colonel Chester. It was an utter failure. Without encumbering our pages, it is enough to say that Mr. Welles declared that "in regard to the proofs of the identity of Laurence and John Washington, who emigrated to this country in 1659, the proofs are in my office." Perhaps they are, but they are certainly not in his book.

With the ridiculous fictions relating to Odin we have nothing to do. There are numerous families or branches of Washingtons in England, and this pedigree tries to connect the emigrants with one of these—the Washingtons of Warton, County Lancaster. Mr. Welles writes, pp. 101 and 105, that Laurence Washington was baptized at Warton in 1625, and his brother John was baptized there in 1627, both being sons of Leonard W. of that place. Now, Colonel Chester wrote last spring: "I have carefully examined that register (Warton) personally, and very carefully, and can declare that no such entries are to be found in it." Where, then, are Mr. Welles's proofs of the baptism? Where are his proofs that Leonard had any two sons named Laurence and John? Above all, where are his proofs of identity? The plain truth is, that no one has yet the faintest proof of the identity of the emigrants with any two known members of

any English family. Simpkinson and Heard found a Sir John with a brother Lawrence of the same date as our Americans; but also a further search proved that both of them lived and died in England. Of course a pedigree is good only so far as proved. Similarity of names may be presumptive evidence, various circumstances may give us moral proof of identity; but mere assertions are impudent attempts to mislead the ignorant. If Mr. Welles has any proofs, it is his duty to present them. If he does not, he is like any other incredible witness, and he should be told plainly that his mere assertions are good for nothing.

As to the rest of his book, we find numerous small errors in the parts which have a historical basis. In regard to the American portion we hope that he has copied correctly from sound authorities, but the lack of proper arrangement prevents critical study, and the general fatuity and stupidity of the whole book discourage the critic. There are some books which defy analysis or correction; they sound like the ballads in 'Alice's Adventures,' and with a show of meaning bewilder the firmest brain. It is so with all of Mr. Welles's work; we cannot correct without re-writing the whole, a task for which we have neither time nor inclination.

Roscher's Political Economy.

2 vols. 8vo, \$7 50.

CONWAY'S DEMONOLOGY and DEVIL-
Lore. 2 vols. 8vo, \$7.

TAINÉ'S FRENCH REVOLUTION. Vol.
I. Large 12mo, \$2 50.

JOHNSON'S CHIEF LIVES of the POETS.
Large 12mo, \$2.

BOSWELL'S LIFE OF JOHNSON. The
Original Text relieved from passages of obsolete interest. Large
12mo, \$2.

KEMBLE'S (FANNY) RECORDS OF A
Girlhood. Large 12mo, \$2 50.

GOODHOLMES'S DOMESTIC CYCLOPÆ-
dia. 8vo, \$5.

HENRY HOLT & CO., NEW YORK.

Continued from page iii.

NEW YORK, Suspension Bridge.
DE VEAUX COLLEGE.—Prepares for the
Universities, etc. Terms \$350 per annum. 20 Foundation
scholarships. Rev. GEO. HERBERT PATTERSON, President.

NEW YORK, Syracuse, 70 James Street.
KEBLE SCHOOL, for Young Ladies.—Rt.
Rev. F. D. Huntington, S.T.D., Pres. Board of Trustees.
For circulars apply to MARY J. JACKSON.

NEW YORK, Troy.
RENSSELAER POLYTECHNIC INSTI-
tute. A School of Civil Engineering.

NEW YORK, Utica.
MRS. PLATT'S SCHOOL for Young Ladies.
—Fall term begins Wednesday, Sept. 17, 1879. Applications
must be made before July 15.

OHIO, Cincinnati, 166 W. Seventh Street and Walnut Hills.
MISS NOURSE'S FAMILY AND DAY
School reopens Sept. 24. Communication by private omni-
bus between home on Walnut Hills and City School.
Pupils are fitted for the Harvard Examinations and for college.
Foreign teachers are resident, and best musical advantages of the
city made available. Circulars sent on application.

OHIO, Cincinnati.
WESLEYAN FEMALE COLLEGE.—
Best advantages in Literature, Science, Languages, Paint-
ing, Wood-Carving, and Music.
Rev. DAVID H. MOORE, D.D., President.

OHIO, Cleveland.
BROOKS ACADEMY.—Autumn half opens
Wednesday, Sept. 10, 1879. A Preparatory School for the
best colleges. Four years' course, two departments—Classical and
English—the latter offering special preparation for the leading
scientific schools. The new catalogue (August, '79), containing a
"Table of Requisitions" for admission to fifteen leading colleges,
will be sent upon receipt of stamp. JOHN S. WHITE, LL.D., Head-
Master.

OHIO, Yellow Springs, Greene Co.
ANTIOCH COLLEGE, in a beautiful and
healthful location, gives to both sexes thorough preparatory
and collegiate education, and fits boys for Eastern colleges. Total
expenses, \$150 to \$200 a year. Write for catalogue to S. C. DERBY,
President.

PENNSYLVANIA, Chester.
PENNSYLVANIA MILITARY ACADE-
my. Opens September 10.
Thorough instruction in Civil Engineering, Chemistry, the Clas-
sics, and English.
Degrees conferred.
For circulars apply to
COL. THEO. HYATT, President.

PENNSYLVANIA, Germantown.
DR. HENRY HARTSHORNE will receive a
few young ladies into his family for advanced instruction.
Competent teachers are engaged. Health is considered in all the
arrangements. Term commences Sept. 17. Address 11 East Penn
Street, Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa.

PENNSYLVANIA, Germantown, West Chelton Avenue,
below Wayne Street.
MISS MARY E. STEVEN'S SCHOOL
for Young Ladies will reopen Thursday, Sept. 19, 1879.
Scholars prepared for the Harvard Examinations for Women.

PENNSYLVANIA, Haverford College P. O.
HAVERFORD COLLEGE, under the care of
the Society of Friends (Orthodox). THOS. CHASE, LL.D.,
President. For catalogues apply to Prof. ALLEN C. THOMAS, Preect.

PENNSYLVANIA, Philadelphia, 1527 and 1529 Spruce Street.
CHEGARAY INSTITUTE.—Boarding and
Day School for Young Ladies and Children. French is the
language of the family. Please send for Circulars.

PENNSYLVANIA, Philadelphia, 1615 Chestnut Street.
CHESTNUT STREET SEMINARY.—
Miss BOSNEY and Miss DILLAYE, Principals. The thirtieth
year will open September 17.

PENNSYLVANIA, Philadelphia.
MEDICAL DEPARTMENT OF THE
University of Pennsylvania. One hundred and fourteenth
Annual Session. The attention of students looking to the pro-
fession of Medicine is particularly called to this the oldest Medical
School in the United States. Recent changes in the curriculum
include a prolongation of the course, and the introduction of much
laboratory teaching and practical instruction in all the branches of
medical science. For an announcement containing full particulars
address JAMES TYSON, M.D., Secretary Faculty of Medicine.

PENNSYLVANIA, Philadelphia, 1350 Pine Street.
MISS ANABLE'S BOARDING and DAY
School will reopen September 24.

PENNSYLVANIA, Philadelphia, Summit St., Chestnut Hill.
MRS. WALTER D. COMEGYS and Miss
Bell's French and English Boarding and Day School for
Young Ladies and Little Girls. Apply until Sept. 1, 1115 Walnut
St.; after that date, Summit Street, Chestnut Hill, Philadelphia.

PENNSYLVANIA, Philadelphia, 4035 Chestnut Street.
WEST CHESTNUT ST. INSTITUTE.
A Home-School for Young Ladies and Children. Term
begins September 17. Mrs. BOGARDUS, Principal.

PENNSYLVANIA, Pottstown, Montgomery Co.
COTTAGE SEMINARY for Young Ladies.
The thirtieth annual session begins on Thursday, Sept. 11,
1879. Limited in number. For catalogues apply to
GEO. G. BUTLER, A.M., Principal.

PENNSYLVANIA, Pottstown.
THE HILL SCHOOL (preparatory to College).
Distinctive work, preparation for best colleges. Graduates
of the school invariably enter college without conditions. English
and Scientific Courses fit for business. Experienced and perma-
nent teachers. Thorough instruction. Home life and culture.
JOHN MEIGS, Ph.D., Principal.

RHODE ISLAND, East Greenwich.
GREENWICH ACADEMY, with Musical
Institute and Com. Coll. Founded 1802. A seaside school.
Both sexes. On direct route from New York to Boston. Board
reduced to \$2 75. For catalogue (free) address Rev. F. D. BLAKES-
LEE, A.M.

RHODE ISLAND, Newport.
MRS. J. H. GILLIAT'S Family and Day
School for Girls.

This is in every respect a home where girls will receive all the
personal care and culture that parents can desire for their children.
The mild and healthful climate of Newport makes it a most de-
sirable location for a school.
Number of boarding pupils limited.

VERMONT, Northfield.
NORWICH UNIVERSITY.—A Military
and Scientific College.

VIRGINIA, near Alexandria.
EPISCOPAL HIGH SCHOOL, near Alexan-
dria, Virginia.—A Boys' School, fitting for college or busi-
ness. The forty-first year opens Wednesday, Sept. 24, 1879.
Terms moderate. Five resident teachers, and liberal provision in
all respects for the improvement and comfort of pupils. Elevated
and beautiful location. Extensive grounds, including an ample
skating pond and thoroughly-equipped Gymnasium. Students
from twelve States. For catalogue address the Principal,
L. M. BLAKFORD, M.A., Alexandria, Va.

WISCONSIN, Milwaukee.
MARKHAM ACADEMY.—A thoroughly re-
liable College-preparatory School for boys. Established in
1864. Address A. MARKHAM, Principal.

Wants.

A GRADUATE of Wesleyan University, of
high standing, desires a position as teacher in a high-school
or academy. The classics or mathematics preferred. Best of
references. Address TEACHER, Old Orchard, Me.

A HARVARD GRADUATE, of high stand-
ing, desires a position as teacher in a high-school or
academy, or as a private tutor. Best of references. Address
H. C. B., Box 266, Leominster, Mass.

A LADY OF EXPERIENCE and ability
would like a position as bookkeeper or cashier, or both. Re-
ferences A No. 1. Address D. K., Box 25.

AN unmarried man, twenty-eight years old, five
years a successful teacher in the United States, three years
a student in Europe, promoted March 15 by the Philosophical
Faculty of Georg-Augusta University, Göttingen, with the highest
honors, to the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, seeks a chair of
Mathematics or Physics. Address WILLIAM B. SMITH, Ph.D.,
care of Prof. John Henry Neville, Lexington, Kentucky.

GERMAN.—An educated North-German family
receives a few responsible persons wishing constant practice
in German, with board. Instruction given in German, French,
Italian, Piano, Singing, Harmony, if desired. Address Mrs. AN-
TONIE SCHRAEDER PLACE, Concord, Mass.

WANTED.—An intelligent young man, who
has had experience in the business, to do canvassing
among teachers in New York and New England for a list of stan-
dard text and reference books. Address PUBLISHER, care of Pub-
lishers' Weekly, Box 4295, New York City.

Two New Handy-Volumes.

PEG WOFFINGTON.

By CHARLES READE.

Forming Number 38 of Appletons' "New Handy-Volume Series."
Paper, 30 cents.

This brilliant novel, in which Charles Reade first made his repu-
tation, will be welcomed in this convenient and attractive pocket
form by all old admirers of the work, and the hosts of younger
readers who are not yet acquainted with it.

"MY QUEEN!"

A Tale. Forming Number 39 of Appletons' "New Handy-Volume
Series." Paper, 25 cents.

Recent issues in the "Handy-Volume Series."

No. 37. *MOVEE*. A Tale. By Jules Tar-
dieu. Paper, 25 cents.

No. 36. *A-SADDLE IN THE WILD WEST*.
Adventures and Travels in Southern Colorado,
Nevada, and Arizona. By William H. Rideing.
Paper, 25 cents.

No. 35. *THE YELLOW MASK*. A Tale
By Wilkie Collins. Paper, 25 cents.

No. 34. *THE LAST ESSAYS OF ELIA*.
By Chas. Lamb. Uniform with 'Essays of Elia.'
Paper, 30 cents.

No. 33. *GEIER-WALLY*. A Romance. By
Wilhelmina Von Hillern. Paper, 30 cents.

No. 32. *A ROGUE'S LIFE*. A Tale. By
Wilkie Collins. Paper, 25 cents.

No. 31. *AN ATTIC PHILOSOPHER IN
Paris*. By Emile Souvestre. Paper, 30 cents.

No. 30. *AN ACCOMPLISHED GENTLE-
man*. A Tale. By Julian Sturgis. Paper, 30
cents.

No. 29. *RUSKIN ON PAINTING*. With a
Biographical Sketch. Paper, 30 cents.

No. 28. *THE GREAT ITALIAN AND
French Composers*. Uniform with "The Great
German Composers." Paper, 30 cents.

No. 26. *THOMAS CARLYLE: His Life—
his Books—his Theories*. Paper, 30 cents.

No. 10. *IMPRESSIONS OF AMERICA*. By
R. W. Dale. A new edition, with additional
chapter entitled "Religion." Paper, 25 cents.

APPLETONS' NEW HANDY VOLUME SERIES is in handsome 18mo
volumes, in large type, of a size convenient for the pocket, or suit-
able for the library-shelf, bound in paper covers. A selection of
the volumes bound also in cloth, 50 cents each.

Any volume mailed, post-paid, to any address within the United
States or Canada, on receipt of the price.

D. APPLETON & CO., Publishers,
549 and 551 Broadway, New York.

D. APPLETON & CO.'S

RECENT PUBLICATIONS:

I.
THE HUMAN SPECIES. By A. De Quatrefages, Professor of Anthropology in the Museum of Natural History, Paris.

CONTEXTS: Book I. Unity of the Human Species; Book II. Origin of the Human Species; Book III. Antiquity of the Human Species; Book IV. Original Localization of the Human Species; Book V. Peopling of the Globe; Book VI. Acclimatization of the Human Species; Book VII. Primitive Man—Formation of the Human Races; Book VIII. Fossil Human Races; Book IX. Present Human Races—Physical Character; Book X. Psychological Character of the Human Species.

1 vol. 12mo, cloth, 498 pages, price \$2. Forming No. 27 of "The International Scientific Series."

II.
CLASSICAL WRITERS. Edited by John Richard Green.

1. MILTON. By Stopford A. Brooke. 16mo, 168 pages, cloth, price 60 cents.

Under the title of "Classical Writers" Messrs. Appleton & Co. have begun the issue of a series of small volumes upon some of the principal classical works, whose authors, whose works, form subjects of study in our colleges, or which are read by the general public. Care is taken to impart information in a thorough and systematic way, while an intelligent interest in the writers and their works is sought to be aroused by a clear and attractive style of treatment. The following volumes are in preparation: Of the ancients—EURIPIDES, HERODOTUS, DEMOSTHENES, SOPHOCLES, VIRGIL, HORACE, CICERO, LIVY; of the moderns—BACON, SPENSER, CHAUCER. Others will follow.

III.
THE DEVELOPMENT OF ENGLISH LITERATURE. The Old English Period. By Brother Azarias, Professor of English Literature in Rock Hill College, Maryland. 1 vol. 12mo, 214 pages, cloth, price \$1 25.

IV.
THE LIFE OF HIS ROYAL HIGHNESS THE PRINCE CONSORT. By Theodore Martin. With Portraits. Vol. IV. 1 vol. 12mo, cloth, price \$2.

V.
FREEDOM IN SCIENCE AND TEACHING. From the German of Ernst Haeckel. With a Prefatory Note by T. H. Huxley, F.R.S. 1 vol. 12mo, cloth, price \$1.

VI.
ESSAYS FROM THE "NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW." Edited by Allen Thorndike Rice; containing papers by W. H. Prescott, by Caleb Cushing, by Ralph Waldo Emerson, by George Bancroft, by John Lothrop Motley, by Washington Irving, by Charles Francis Adams, by Henry Wadsworth Longfellow, by George William Curtis, by Francis Parkman, by James Russell Lowell, and by Oliver Wendell Holmes.

"The essays collected in this volume may, without pretension, be truly said to represent the growth of native thought and scholarship in the United States from the close of the second war with Great Britain down to the close of the great Civil War. In few libraries, public or private, can complete sets of the *North American Review* be found, and the best thoughts and the freshest activity of two generations of conspicuous American writers have thus remained inaccessible to the great mass of the American reading public.

"It is to afford the present generation of readers an easy access to this most interesting chapter of our literary history that, with the kind permission of such of the authors as are still living, this volume is now given to the public."—*Extract from Preface.*

One vol. 12mo, 452 pages, cloth, price \$2.

VII.
EPIPHANIES OF THE RISEN LORD. By George Dana Boardman, D.D., author of 'The Creative Week' and 'Studies in the Model Prayer.'

"In arranging the 'Epiphanies of the Risen Lord' the author is aware that there are difficulties in harmonizing the accounts of them as given by the Evangelists. Nor is it strange that there should be these difficulties. In the first place, Christ's risen body was an absolutely unique body, endowed with supernatural properties, and as such capable of moving with supernatural celerity, and therefore might have seemed to appear in different places at practically the same moment. Secondly, it was a period of intense excitement among the disciples; they had suddenly and most unexpectedly lost their beloved Master; so absolutely were all their hopes crushed that the thought did not occur to them that they would ever see him again; accordingly, his sudden reappearance was to them a total, bewildering surprise; no wonder that under such circumstances absolute harmony of separate accounts would have been almost impossible."—*Extract from Preface.*

One vol. 12mo, cloth, price \$1 25.

VIII.
THE EVOLUTION OF MAN. A Popular Exposition of the Principal Points of Human Ontogeny and Phylogeny. From the German of Ernst Haeckel. Professor in the University of Jena, author of 'The History of Creation,' etc. With numerous illustrations. In two vols. 12mo, cloth, price \$5.

IX.
MODERN CHROMATICS. with Applications to Art and Industry. With 130 original illustrations, and frontispiece in colors. By Ogden N. Root, Professor of Physics in Columbia College. Forming No. 26 of "The International Scientific Series." 1 vol. 12mo, cloth, price \$2.

X.
THE HISTORICAL POETRY OF THE ANCIENT HEBREWS. Translated and critically examined by Michael Heilprin. Vol. I. Crown 8vo, cloth, price \$2.

For sale by all booksellers. Any volume sent by mail, post paid, to any address in the United States, on receipt of price.

D. APPLETON & CO., Publishers,
449 and 551 Broadway, New York.

Heliotype.

Permanent Photographic Book Illustrations.

THE HELIOTYPE PRINTING COMPANY are producers of Book Illustrations by the Heliotype, Photo-lithographic, and Photo-engraving processes. Employed by the United States Government in illustrating Scientific and Medical Reports, by Scientific, Historical, and other learned Societies, by the leading publishers, and for illustrating Town and Family Histories, etc., etc.

Facsimiles of Medals and Coins, Ancient MSS., Paintings, Drawings and Sketches, Views and Portraits from Nature, Medical and Scientific objects, Antiquities, etc., etc.

For terms and specimens apply to the

HELIOTYPE PRINTING COMPANY,
220 Devonshire Street, Boston, Mass.

To Tourists.

The Lake Superior Transit Company's Excursion Rate Book for 1879 is now ready. Copies can be obtained of

T. P. CARPENTER, Gen. Pass. Agent,
Atlantic Dock, Buffalo, N. Y.

To Summer Tourists.

ALLAN LINE

ROYAL MAIL STEAMSHIPS

FROM BALTIMORE TO HALIFAX, and vice versa.

The A 1 British Iron Screw Steamships
HIBERNIAN, 3,200 tons, Capt., Lieut. Archer, R.N.R.,
NOVA SCOTIAN, 3,200 tons, Capt. Richardson,
CASPIAN, 3,100 tons, Capt. Trocks,
Leave Baltimore every other Wednesday for

HALIFAX, NOVA SCOTIA.

Cabin Passage to Halifax, \$20 gold; Round-Trip ticket, \$35 gold, including everything except wines, etc.

This is an excellent opportunity to enjoy a brief ocean trip on First-class Transatlantic Steamships and the charming summer climate of Nova Scotia.

First Cabin to St. John's, Newfoundland, \$22 gold; First Cabin to Liverpool, \$75 gold.

For further information apply to

A. SCHUMACHER & CO.,

Or to LEVE & N.,
5 South Broadway, New York.

CUNARD ESTABLISHED 1840
FOR QUEENSTOWN AND LIVERPOOL.

Sailing from New York every Wednesday. From Boston once a week.

RATES OF PASSAGE:

CABIN—\$20, \$100, and \$130, gold, according to accommodation. Return tickets on favorable terms.

STEERAGE—\$25 currency. For freight or passage apply to

C. G. FRANCKLYN,

Bowling Green, New York.

NORTH GERMAN LLOYD
STEAMSHIP COMPANY
FOR SOUTHAMPTON AND BREMEN.

The Steamers of this Company will sail every Saturday from Bremen Pier, foot of Third Street, Hoboken.

RATES OF PASSAGE TO LONDON, HAVRE, AND BREMEN.

First Cabin, \$100; Second Cabin, \$60. Steerage, \$30.
For Freight or passage apply to

OELRICHS & CO., AGENTS,
2 Bowling Green.

OLD AND RELIABLE

VANITY FAIR

(Flake Cut).

FRAGRANT VANITY FAIR TOBACCO AND CIGARETTES

(Long Cut).

"MILD"—Rare Old Virginia. "HALVES"—Rare Old Perique and Virginia. New Combinations of these Fragrant Tobaccos. Always up to the standard. Six First Prize Medals. Paris, 1878.

Peerless Tobacco Works.

WM. S. KIMBALL & CO.,
Rochester, N. Y.

BROWN BROTHERS & CO.

59 WALL STREET,

ISSUE COMMERCIAL AND TRAVELLERS' CREDITS

For use in

THIS COUNTRY AND ABROAD.

WINSLOW, LANIER & CO.,

BANKERS,

HAVE FOR SALE SECURITIES FOR SAFE AND PERMANENT INVESTMENT.

S. G. & G. C. WARD,

AGENTS FOR

BARING BROTHERS & COMPANY

42 Wall Street, New York.

26 State Street, Boston.

WILLIAM T. MEREDITH,

37 WILLIAM STREET, NEW YORK,

DEALER IN INVESTMENT SECURITIES AND COMMERCIAL PAPER.

KOUNTZE BROTHERS,

BANKERS,

12 WALL STREET, NEW YORK,

Issue LETTERS OF CREDIT or CIRCULAR NOTES on the UNION BANK OF LONDON,

Available for Travellers in all parts of the world.

Pratt's Astral Oil.

PERFECTLY SAFE.

Especially adapted for use in the St. Germain Student Lamp.

CHAS. PRATT & CO.,

Box 3050.

NEW YORK

PATENT

Prepared Gasolene

FOR GAS-MACHINES.

Made by a new method; an absolutely pure article. Does not deteriorate in quality as the process of evaporation within the machine progresses. Every barrel guaranteed.

Address the manufacturers,

CHARLES PRATT & CO.

(Established 1770),

128 Pearl Street, New York.

F. W. CHRISTERN,

Foreign Bookseller and Importer,

180 FIFTH AVENUE, NEW YORK.

The principal publications of Charpentier, Didot, Didot, Hachette, Levy, etc., on hand; also, complete sets of Tauchnitz's collection of British Authors and Teubner's Greek and Roman Classics. Catalogues mailed on demand. European Periodicals received weekly.

The Boston Foreign Book Store

Removed to the elegant store, 146 Tremont Street, second north of West.

CARL SCHOENHOF,

Foreign Bookseller and Importer.

FOR HOME AND OFFICE LIBRARIES.

THE PORTABLE BOOKCASE.

EASTLAKE DESIGN. PRICES REDUCED.

These cases, made of various woods, with leather fringe to match other furniture, are of exceptional value, and give the greatest satisfaction to all who use them. Two sizes, in walnut and pine, always on hand, and special cases of any size or wood promptly supplied. Send for descriptive circular and price-list. Address the sole makers,

LOCKWOOD, BROOKS & CO., 381 Washington Street, Boston.

